

* THE AMERICAN *
CHURCH HISTORY SERIES


Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



BR 515 .A57 1893 v.2 c.2
Carroll, Henry K. 1848-1931.
The religious forces of the
United States





The American Church History Series

CONSISTING OF A SERIES OF
DENOMINATIONAL HISTORIES PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

General Editors

REV. PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., LL. D. BISHOP JOHN F. HURST, D. D., LL. D.

RT. REV. H. C. POTTER, D. D., LL. D. REV. E. J. WOLF, D. D.

REV. G. O. P. FISHER, D. D., LL. D. HENRY C. VEDDER, M. A.

REV. SAMUEL M. JACKSON, D. D., LL. D.

VOLUME II

American Church History

A HISTORY
OF THE
BAPTIST CHURCHES
IN THE UNITED STATES

✓ BY

A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, TORONTO.



New York
The Christian Literature Co.

MDCCCXCIV

Copyright, 1894,

BY THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY.

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| INTRODUCTION.—Distinctive Principles.—Relation to other Bodies. —Ancient Perversions of Baptism.—Other Ancient Perversions.— Medieval Antipedobaptists.—Medieval Evangelical Life.—The An- abaptists.—The Zwickau Prophets.—The Swiss Anabaptists.—An- abaptists of Silesia, Austria, and Augsburg.—Anabaptists of Strass- burg and Hesse.—Moravian Anabaptists.—Chiliastic Anabaptists. —Munster Kingdom.—The Mennonites.—Italian and Polish Anabaptists.—Remarks.—English General Baptists.—General Bap- tists.—Particular Baptists. | I |

PERIOD I.

FROM THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH IN AMERICA TO THE GREAT AWAKENING (1639-1740).

| | |
|---|-----|
| CHAP. I.—ROGER WILLIAMS AND LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE. | 59 |
| CHAP. II.—ROGER WILLIAMS AND THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH IN AMERICA.—Williams and the Providence Baptists.—Arminianism and Laying on of Hands.—Thomas Olney.—William Wickenden.— Gregory Dexter.—Chad Brown. | 79 |
| CHAP. III.—JOHN CLARKE AND THE BAPTISTS OF NEWPORT.—Set- tlement of Rhode Island.—Providence Plantations.—Clarke and Liberty of Conscience.—Clarke as Counselor and Agent.—The New Charter of 1663.—Clarke as a Baptist.—Holmes, Lukar, and Weeden.—William Peckham.—Comer Accepts Imposition of Hands.—Six Principle Associations. | 96 |
| CHAP. IV.—BAPTISTS IN MASSACHUSETTS TO 1652.—New England Puritanism.—The Antinomian Controversy.—Baptists Misunder- stood.—Witter and Painter.—Law against Baptists.—Unfounded Charges.—Zeal in Persecution.—Chauncy's Antipedobaptism.— Newport Baptists at Lynn.—Clarke's Defense. | 118 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| CHAP. V.—PRESIDENT HENRY DUNSTER AND THE BAPTISTS.—Dunster in New England.—President of Harvard.—Oriental Studies.—Rejects Infant Baptism.—Mitchell's Experiences.—Proceedings against Dunster.—Conference on Infant Baptism.—A Humble Petition.—Prosecution, or Persecution?—Invited to Dublin.—Dunster's Death and Will. | 139 |
| CHAP. VI.—BAPTIST CHURCHES IN MASSACHUSETTS TO 1740.—First Baptist Church of Wales.—Myles a Tester.—Myles Holds a Benefice.—Swansea Exclusiveness.—A New Pastor Wanted.—Act for Support of Ministers.—First Baptist Church of Boston.—Confession of Faith.—A Disputation.—Thirty Years of Progress.—The Half-way Covenant.—Intolerance Rebuked.—Persecution Continues.—Mitigation of Persecution.—Charles II. Rebukes Intolerance.—The Meeting-house Closed.—Baptists Tolerated.—Hollis's Benefactions.—Comer's Death. | 162 |
| CHAP. VII.—BAPTISTS IN PENNSYLVANIA AND THE JERSEYS.—Penn and Pennsylvania.—Pennepek and Piscataqua.—Cohansey and Philadelphia.—The Keithian, Quakers.—Mennonites and Dunkards.—Philadelphia Association.—Queries Answered.—A Dearth of Pastors. | 200 |
| CHAP. VIII.—THE FIRST BAPTISTS OF MAINE, SOUTH CAROLINA, VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, CONNECTICUT, AND NEW YORK.—Screven's Ordination.—Persecution at Kittery.—Screven Goes to Carolina.—Early Baptists of Carolina.—Religious Destitution.—Screven's Last Days.—Virginia Excludes Dissent.—Early Baptists of Connecticut.—Wickenden at Flushing.—First Churches of New York | 216 |

PERIOD II.

FROM THE GREAT AWAKENING TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE
TRIENNIAL CONVENTION (1740-1814).

| | |
|---|-----|
| CHAP. I.—NEW ENGLAND.—The Great Awakening.—The New Lights.—Separates Become Baptists.—Isaac Backus.—Backus Becomes a Baptist.—A Mixed Church.—First Church, Providence.—First Church, Newport.—Second Church, Boston.—Hezekiah Smith.—Brown University.—The Warren Association.—Baptists in New Hampshire.—Vermont and Maine.—Statistics. | 239 |
| CHAP. II.—THE PHILADELPHIA CENTER.—The Philadelphia Association.—Records Collected.—A Baptist College Proposed.—Edwards, Jones, and Morgan.—New York.—New York Association. | 272 |
| CHAP. III.—VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA.—Virginia.—The Ke-tokton Association.—General Baptist Churches.—The Kehukee | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Association.—Marshall and Stearns.—Sandy Creek Association.— The Association Dissolved.—Arminianism.—Philadelphia Confes- sion Adopted.—Rapid Increase.—Protest against Slavery.—Prog- ress in North Carolina. | 284 |
| CHAP. IV.—SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA.—Oliver Hart.—Charles- ton Association.—Richard Furman.—Settlement of Georgia.— Daniel Marshall.—The Georgia Association.—Henry Holcombe.— The Powelton Conference.—Christian Union.—A Circular Ad- dress.—The General Committee.—Colored Baptists. | 308 |
| CHAP. V.—KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, OHIO, INDIANA, ILLINOIS, MIS- SOURI, MISSISSIPPI, AND LOUISIANA.—Regulars and Separates.— Middle Tennessee.—A German Church.—Illinois.—Missouri.— Mississippi and Louisiana | 333 |
| CHAP. VI.—STRUGGLES FOR CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN NEW ENGLAND.—A Threatened Appeal.—Oppression at Ashfield.—An Appeal for Liberty.—Massachusetts Praises Toleration.—Confer- ence in Philadelphia.—Manning's Memorial.—A New Constitution. —Liberty in Massachusetts, 1833. | 347 |
| CHAP. VII.—THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE IN VIR- GINIA.—Prayer for Persecutors.—Marriage Law.—Repeal of In- corporating Act.—Washington and the Baptists.—Jefferson and the Baptists. | 365 |

PERIOD III.

FROM THE ORGANIZATION OF THE TRIENNIAL CONVENTION TO
THE PRESENT TIME (1814-1894).

| | |
|--|-----|
| CHAP. I.—RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT.—Early Educational Ef- forts.—Illiterate Preachers.—Early Missionary Societies.—The Ad- vance Movement. | 379 |
| CHAP. II.—THE TRIENNIAL CONVENTION (1814-45).—Conversion of the Judsons.—The News Reaches America.—General Conven- tion.—Ministerial Education.—Home Mission Work.—Columbian College.—Restriction of Effort.—State Conventions.—New Eng- land Conventions.—Education in South Carolina.—Education in New York.—Education in Georgia.—Illinois and North Carolina. —Education in Virginia.—Indiana and Kentucky Colleges. | 388 |
| CHAP. III.—THE TRIENNIAL CONVENTION, <i>Continued</i> .—Home Mis- sions.—Religious Newspapers.—Newspapers and Reviews.— Baptist Tract Society.—Baptists Protest.—Bible Controversies.— End of Bible Controversy.—Anti-effort Baptists.—Opposition to Missions.—Causes of Opposition.—Progress Notwithstanding. . . . | 419 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| CHAP. IV.—THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.—Fuller and Wayland on Slavery.—Southern Dissatisfaction.—Division Inevitable.—Southern Baptist Convention.—Coöperation with other Societies.—Home Mission Board.—The Cuban Mission.—Mountain Work.—Foreign Mission Work.—“ Omissionary ” Baptists.—The Colored Baptists.—Theological Seminary..... | 443 |
| CHAP. V.—NORTHERN, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIETIES, AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (1845-94).—Missionary Union.—Foreign Missions.—Home Missions.—Publication Society.—Education Society.—Historical Society, and Congress.—Education. | 468 |
| CHAP. VI.—DIVISIONS AND PARTIES, AND CONCLUDING REMARKS.—The Seventh-day Baptists.—The Disciples.—Baptists and Disciples.—Old-Landmarkism.—Free-will Baptists.—The Christians.—Other Baptist Parties..... | 484 |

A HISTORY OF
THE BAPTISTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, CANADA.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

THE literature on the antipedobaptist movements of the medieval and Reformation times is too voluminous to be here given. A selection of a few of the more important works bearing upon the history of English Baptists is all that seems practicable. Most of the works referred to in the Bibliography of vol. iii. of the present series are of interest to the student of Baptist history. Colonial records are among the most valuable sources. For the later period, files of denominational newspapers and magazines, minutes of Associations, reports of denominational societies, State and national, and controversial pamphlets may be consulted with profit. Morton's "New England's Memorial"; Lechford's "Plain Dealing"; Winslow's "Good News from New England"; Willard's "*Ne Sutor ultra Crepidam*"; Uhden's "New England Theocracy"; Chauncy's "Seasonable Thoughts"; and Edwards's works bearing on the Great Awakening, may be referred to in this brief way.

The treatises on Systematic Theology, by Drs. A. Hovey, A. H. Strong, E. Dodge, E. H. Johnson, W. N. Clarke, J. P. Boyce, and E. G. Robinson, may be referred to as illustrating the unity and variety of Baptist doctrinal teaching. The controversial writings of Isaac Backus are too numerous to be referred to individually, but are of primary importance.

I. ENGLISH BAPTIST HISTORY.

Barclay, Robert, *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*. 3d ed., London, 1879.

Clifford, John (editor), *The English Baptists*. London, 1881.

Crosby, Thomas, *The History of the English Baptists*. 4 vols., London, 1738-1740.

Evans, B., *The Early English Baptists*. 2 vols., London, 1862.

Goadby, Thomas, *By-paths of Baptist History*. London, 1871.

Gould, Geo., *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich*. Norwich, 1860.

Ivimey, Joseph, *A History of the English Baptists*. 4 vols., London, 1811-1830.

Masson, David, *Life of John Milton, and History of his Time*. 6 vols., London, 1859-1880.

Publications of the Hanserd Knollys Society. 10 vols., London, 1846 seq.

Taylor, Adam, *The History of the English General Baptists*. 2 vols., London, 1818.

II. ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BAPTIST HISTORY.

- Armitage, Thomas, *A History of the Baptists*. New York, 1887.
 Benedict, David, *A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and Other Parts of the World*. New York, 1848.
 ———, *Fifty Years among the Baptists*. New York, 1860.
 Cook, R. B., *Story of the Baptists*. Baltimore, 1884.
 Cramp, J. M., *Baptist History*. Philadelphia.
 Vedder, Henry C., *Short History of the Baptists*. Philadelphia, 1892.

III. AMERICAN BAPTIST HISTORY.

- Adlam, S., *Origin of the Institutions of Rhode Island*. Providence, 1871.
 Allen, I. M., *The United States Baptist Annual Register and Almanac*. Philadelphia, 1833.
 Arnold, S. G., *History of the State of Rhode Island*. Vol. i., New York, 1859.
 Asplund, John, *The Universal Register of the Baptist Denomination in North America, for the Years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, and part of 1794*. Boston, 1794.
 Babcock, R., *Memoir of J. M. Peck*. Philadelphia, 1864.
 Backus, Isaac, *A History of New England. With Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians called Baptists*. 2d ed., with Notes by D. Weston. 2 vols. Newton, 1871.
 ———, *Baptist Home Missions in North America, 1832-1882*. New York, 1883.
 Barrows, C. E., *Historical Sketch of the First Baptist Church, Newport, R. I.* Newport, 1876.
 ———, *The Development of Baptist Principles in Rhode Island*. Philadelphia.
 Bitting, C. C., *Bibl. Societies and the Baptists*. Philadelphia, 1883.
 Boykin, S., *Memoir of Abel Sturtevant, D.D.* Philadelphia, 1884.
 Broadus, A. (Jr.), *The Sermons and Other Writings of the Rev. Andrew Broadus. With a Memoir of his Life by J. B. Jeter, D.D.* New York, Colby, 1852.
 Broadus, J. A., *Memoir of J. P. Boyce*. New York, 1893.
 Brown, J. N., *History of the American Baptist Publication Society [1824-1850]*. Philadelphia.
 Burkitt, Lemuel, and Read, Jesse, *A Concise History of the Kechuke Baptist Association*. Revised ed., Philadelphia, 1850.
 Burrage, Henry S., *A History of the Baptists in New England*. Philadelphia, 1894.
 ———, *Baptist Hymn-writers and their Hymns*. Portland, 1888.
 ———, *The Act of Baptism*. Philadelphia, 1879.
 Caldwell, S. M., and Gammell, W., *History of the First Baptist Church in Providence, 1639-1877*. Providence, 1877.
 Callender, John, *An Historical Picture of the Civil and Religious Affairs of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*. Boston, 1739; reprinted with Notes by Elton, 1838.
 Campbell, Alexander, *The Christian Baptist [1822-1830]*. Cincinnati, 1880.
 ———, *The Millennial Harbinger, 1830-1870*.

- Campbell, J. H.**, *Georgia Baptists*. Macon, 1874.
- Cathcart, W.**, *The Baptist Encyclopedia*. 2 vols., Philadelphia, Everts, 1881.
- , *The Baptists and the American Revolution*. Philadelphia.
- Chaplin, J.**, *Life of Henry Dunster*. Boston, 1872.
- Clarke, John**, *111 Newses from New England; or, A Narrative of New England's Persecution*. London, 1652; reprinted in "Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society," 4th series, vol. ii., Boston, 1854.
- Comer, John**, *The Diary of*. Philadelphia, 1892.
- Cook, R. B.**, *The Early and Later Delaware Baptists*. Philadelphia, Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1880.
- Cox, F. A., and Hoby, J.**, *The Baptists in America*. New York, 1836.
- Crane, C. B.**, *First Baptist Church, Boston: Bi-Centenary Commemoration*. Boston, 1865.
- Curry, J. L. M.**, *Struggles and Triumphs of Virginia Baptists*. Philadelphia, 1873.
- Curtis, T. F.**, *The Progress of Baptist Principles in the Last Hundred Years*. Boston, 1860.
- Cuthbert, J. H.**, *Life of Dr. Richard Fuller*. New York, 1879.
- Cutting, S. S.**, *Historical Vindications*. Boston, 1859.
- Denison, F.**, *Notes on the Baptists and their Principles in Norwich, Conn.* Norwich, 1857.
- Dexter, Henry M.**, *As to Roger Williams*. Boston, 1876.
- Duncan, R. S.**, *A History of the Baptists in Missouri*. St. Louis, 1883.
- Dunster, S.**, *History of the Dunster Family*. Boston, 1876.
- Edwards, Morgan**, *Materials for a History of the American Baptists: Vol. i., Materials towards a History of the Baptists in Pennsylvania, both British and German*. Philadelphia, 1770. Vol. ii., *Materials towards a History of the Baptists of Jersey*. Philadelphia, 1792.
- , *Materials for a History of the Baptists of Rhode Island*. In "Rhode Island Historical Collections," vol. vi.
- , *Materials towards a History of the Baptists in Delaware State*. Philadelphia, 1885.
- Everts, W. W.**, *William Colgate*. Philadelphia, 1881.
- Furman, Wood**, *A History of the Charleston [S. C.] Association*. Charleston, 1811.
- Gammell, W.**, *Life of Roger Williams*. Boston, 1844.
- Guild, R. A.**, *History of Brown University*. Providence, 1867.
- , *Life, Journals, Letters, and Addresses of the Rev. Hezekiah Smith, D.D., of Haverhill, Mass., 1737-1805*. Philadelphia, 1885.
- , *Life, Times, and Correspondence of James Manning*. Boston, 1864.
- Hague, William**, *An Historical Discourse: . . . Second Centennial Anniversary of the First Baptist Church in Providence, R. I.* Providence, 1839.
- History of the Baptist Denomination in Georgia*. Compiled for the "Christian Index." Atlanta, 1881.
- Holcombe, Henry**, *The First-fruits*. Philadelphia, 1812.
- Holcombe, Hosea**, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Alabama*. Philadelphia, 1840.
- Hovey, Alvah**, *A Memoir of the Life and Times of the Rev. Isaac Backus, A.M.* Boston, 1859.

- Jeter, J. B.**, *Campbellism Examined*. New York, 1857.
 ———, *Campbellism Examined*. New York, 1857.
 ———, *Life of Samuel Will.*
- Jones, H. G.**, *Historical Sketch of the Lower Dublin (or Pennepek) Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.* Morrisania, N. Y., 1869.
 ———, *History of the Roxborough Baptist Church of Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, 1890.
- Judson, E.**, *The Life of Adoniram Judson*. New York, 1883.
- King, A.**, *Memoir of George Dana Boardman*. Boston, 1834.
- King, Henry M.**, *Early Baptists Defended*. Boston, 1880.
- Knight, R.**, *History of the General or Six Principle Baptists*. Providence, 1827.
- Knowles, J. D.**, *Memoir of Roger Williams*. Boston, 1834.
- Leland, John**, *The Rights of Conscience Inalienable*. Richmond, 1793.
- Lewis, A. H.**, *A Critical History of Sunday Legislation*. New York, 1888.
- , *A Critical History of the Sabbath and the Sunday in the Christian Church*. Alfred Centre, N. Y., 1887.
 ———, *Biblical Teachings Concerning the Sabbath and the Sunday*. Alfred Centre, N. Y., 1888.
- Life of Spencer Houghton Cone*. New York, Livermore, 1856.
- Lynd, S. W.**, *Memoir of the Rev. William Staughton*. Boston, 1834.
- Mallary, C. D.**, *Memories of Elder Edmund Botsford*. Charleston, 1832.
 ———, *Memoirs of Elder Jesse Mercer*. New York, 1844.
- Mercer, Jesse**, *A History of the Georgia Baptist Association*.
Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association from A.D. 1707 to A.D. 1807. Philadelphia, 1851.
- Moss, Lemuel** (editor), *The Baptists and the National Centenary*. Philadelphia, 1876.
- Paxton, W. E.**, *A History of the Baptists of Louisiana*. St. Louis, 1888.
- Peck, J. M.**, *"Father Clark": or, The Pioneer Preacher*. New York, 1855.
- Peck, John, and Lawton, John**, *An Historical Sketch of the Baptist Missionary Convention of the State of New York*. Utica, 1837.
- Proceedings of the Baptist Convention for Missionary Purposes, held in Philadelphia in May, 1814*. Philadelphia, 1814.
- Proceedings of the Bible Convention, held at Saratoga, N. Y., May 22, 23, 1853*. Philadelphia.
- Proceedings of the National Baptist Educational Convention, 1870 and 1872*. New York, 1870 and 1872.
- Proceedings of the Seventh-day Baptist Council, held at Chicago, Ill., October 22-29, 1890. With an Historical Sketch of American Seventh-day Baptist Churches, and Exposé of Faith and Practice*.
- Publications of the Narragansett Club* [embracing the Works of Roger Williams, and John Cotton's Writings on liberty of conscience]. Providence, 1866-1874.
- Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England*. Vol. i., Providence, 1856.
- Richardson, R.**, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*. 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1868-1870.
- Russel, John**, *A Brief Narrative of Some Considerable Passages Concerning the First Gathering and Further Progress of a Church of Christ, in Gospel Order, in Boston, in New England, commonly (though falsely) called by the name of Anabaptists*. London, 1680.

- Sampey, J. R.**, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary* [1859-1889.] Baltimore, 1890.
- Semi-Centennial Celebration of the Rhode Island Baptist State Convention, May 12, 1875.* Providence, 1875.
- Sample, R. B.**, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia.* Richmond, 1810; new ed., edited by G. W. Beale, Richmond, Pitt & Dickinson, 1894.
- Smith, J. A.**, *Memoir of Rev. Nathaniel Colver.* Boston, 1875.
- Smith, J. W.**, *The Life of John P. Crozer.* Philadelphia, 1868.
- Smith, S. F.**, *Missionary Sketches.* Boston, 1883.
- Spencer, David**, *The Early Baptists of Philadelphia.* Philadelphia, 1877.
- Stewart, I. D.**, *Minutes of the General Conference of the Free-will Baptist Connection.* 2 vols., Boston, 1887.
- , *The History of the Free-will Baptists.* Vol. i., 1780-1830. Dover, 1862.
- Stockbridge, J. C.**, *A Memoir of the Life and Correspondence of Rev. Baron Stow.* Boston, 1872; 2d ed., 1894.
- Stone, E. M.**, *Biography of Rev. Elhanan Winchester.* Boston, 1836.
- Straus, Oscar S.**, *Roger Williams, the Pioneer of Religious Liberty.* New York, 1894.
- Taylor, G. B.**, *Life and Times of J. B. Taylor.* Philadelphia, 1872.
- Taylor, James B.**, *Memoir of Rev. Luther Rice.* Baltimore, 1840.
- , *Virginia Baptist Ministers.* 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1859.
- The Centennial Record of the Free-will Baptists, 1780-1880.* Dover, 1881.
- The First Century of the First Baptist Church of Richmond, Va., 1780-1880.* Richmond, 1880.
- The Life and Times of the Rev. James Ireland.* Winchester, Va., 1819.
- The Missionary Jubilee: An Account of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the American Baptist Missionary Union.* New York, 1869.
- Thomas, David**, *The Virginian Baptist; or, A View and Defense of the Christian Religion as it is Professed by the Baptists of Virginia.* Baltimore, Enoch Story, 1774.
- True, B. O.**, *Increase and Characteristics of Connecticut Baptists.* Meriden, 1887.
- Tupper, H. A.** (editor), *A Decade of Foreign Missions, 1880-1890.* Richmond, 1891.
- , *Foreign Missions of the Southern Baptist Convention.* Richmond, 1880.
- , *Two Centuries of the First Baptist Church of South Carolina, 1683-1883.* Baltimore, 1889.
- Vedder, H. C.**, *Baptists and Liberty of Conscience.* Cincinnati, 1884.
- Wayland, Francis**, *A Memoir of the Life and Labors of the Rev. Adoniram Judson, D.D.* 2 vols., Boston, 1853.
- , *Principles and Practices of the Baptists.* New York, 1857.
- Wayland, F. and H. L.**, *A Memoir of the Life and Labors of Francis Wayland.* 2 vols., New York, 1868.
- Williams, Roger**, *Christenings Make Not Christians.* In "Rhode Island Historical Tracts," No. 14. Providence, 1881.

INTRODUCTION.

I. DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF THE BAPTISTS.

THE name " Baptist " was not a self-chosen one. In the early Reformation time those who withdrew from the dominant churches because of the failure of these churches to discriminate between the church and the world, between the regenerate and the unregenerate, and who sought to organize churches of believers only, laid much stress on the lack of Scriptural warrant for the baptism of infants and on the incompatibility of infant baptism with regenerate membership. Following what they believed to be apostolic precept and example, they made baptism on a profession of faith a condition of church-fellowship. This rejection of infant baptism and this insistence on believers' baptism were so distinctive of these Christians that they were stigmatized as " Anabaptists," " Catabaptists," and sometimes as simply " Baptists "; that is to say, they were declared to be " rebaptizers," " perversers of baptism," or, as unduly magnifying baptism and making it the occasion of schism, simply " baptizers." These party names they earnestly repudiated, preferring to call themselves Brethren, Christians, Disciples of Christ, Believers, etc.

Some of the distinctive principles of Baptists have already been referred to. The following enumeration may not be out of place :

1. Baptists of all parties have, from the beginning, persistently and consistently maintained the absolute suprem-

acy of the canonical Scriptures as a norm of faith and practice. They have insisted on applying the Scripture test positively and negatively to every detail of doctrine and practice. It has never seemed to them sufficient to show that a doctrine or practice, made a matter of faith, is not contradictory of Scripture; it must be distinctly a matter of Scripture precept or example to command their allegiance or secure from them a recognition of its right to exist.

2. The application of this principle that has done more than any other to put Baptists at variance with other evangelical Christians regards the matter of infant baptism. Baptists have failed to find Scriptural authorization, whether by precept or example, for the administration of baptism to infants. They have persistently maintained that this practice is not only non-Scriptural, but that it is distinctly contra-Scriptural; that it is not merely the introduction of a rite not authorized by Scripture, yet innocent and useful, but a complete perversion of one of the two ordinances that our Lord gave to his church for the symbolical setting forth of the great truths of redemption. Believing that baptism merely symbolizes but does not bestow or condition regeneration, they have regarded it as preposterous that the symbol should antedate by years the thing symbolized; nay, that the symbolical rite should be bestowed without any assurance that the thing symbolized would ever occur.

But not only have Baptists agreed in regarding infant baptism as without Scriptural warrant and as a perversion of an ordinance established by Christ, but they have always insisted that it is in a very high degree destructive of the true conception of the church as composed exclusively of regenerate persons. If baptism in unconscious infancy entitle a person to church-membership, in any

sense, and do not actually work regeneration, and if those who have been thus baptized are admitted to all the privileges of church-membership after a period of somewhat formal instruction, without evidence of change of heart, a large proportion of the members of such communions are sure to be unregenerate persons. Moreover, Baptists have regarded infant baptism as the almost necessary concomitant of a state church. If there be an established form of Christianity in any particular state, it must, according to the medieval conception, be coextensive in its membership with the population of the state. If membership in the church depended upon the conversion and the baptism on a profession of faith of each individual, such a coincidence of church-membership with population would be out of the question. Hence, apparently, the determination that the friends of church establishments have always shown to maintain infant baptism at whatever cost.

3. No less prominent has been the contention of Baptists for regenerate membership. They have persistently maintained that the New Testament conception of the church universal is that of the entire body of those that have become personally partakers of the salvation of Christ; that the New Testament idea of a local church is that of a body of believers who have been regenerated and sanctified. This principle, far more than the rejection of infant baptism, or insistence on believers' baptism, or contention for the precise New Testament form of baptism, has always been fundamental with Baptists. The baptism of infants has been rejected not simply because it is non-Scriptural, but even more because of its incompatibility with regenerate membership.

4. Believing that faith is a matter between the individual man and God, Baptists have, from the beginning of their denominational history, regarded as an enormity any

attempt to force the conscience, or to constrain men by outward penalties to this or that form of religious belief. Persecution may make men hypocrites, but true Christians never. Their advocacy of absolute liberty of conscience has been due not simply to the fact that they have been the suffering parties, but is rather a logical result of their fundamental principles.

5. Insistence on immersion as the only allowable form of baptism should not be omitted from an enumeration of Baptist principles; neither should it have the prominent place that many opponents are wont to give it. The uncompromising position that Baptists have long held on this matter is a corollary of their maintenance of the authority and the sufficiency of Scripture as a norm of faith and practice, and their firm conviction that the outward act commanded by Christ and exemplified by Christ and his immediate followers was the immersion of believers in water. Anything short of complete immersion they have long been unanimous in regarding as an impertinent substitute for that which Christ appointed, and as voiding the ordinance of its true symbolical significance.

II. RELATION OF BAPTISTS TO OTHER BODIES OF CHRISTIANS.

While on the points of doctrine and practice already considered Baptists believe that they have occupied a position that has advantageously differentiated them from all other bodies of Christians, they rejoice to see that many of the principles for which they have stood in the past have become the common possessions of evangelical Christendom. The doctrine of the supremacy and sufficiency of Scripture as a norm of faith and practice was professed by the great Protestant leaders of the sixteenth

century; but they were driven by observation of what seemed to them the ruinous consequences of the practical carrying out of this principle essentially to modify their statement of the doctrine. Most evangelical denominations of the present time profess to make the Scriptures supreme, yet, on grounds that seem to Baptists wholly inadmissible, many of them refuse to accept the findings of the best evangelical scholarship of the age as to the subjects and mode of New Testament baptism.

Baptists have, for the most part, been at one with the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, and most Protestant communions in accepting for substance the so-called Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian creeds, not, however, because they are venerable or because of the decisions of ecclesiastical councils, but because, and only in so far as, they have appeared to them to be in accord with Scripture. Yet some Baptist parties have not merely repudiated all extra-Scriptural definitions of doctrine, but have interpreted the Scriptures in such a manner as to put themselves at variance with these ancient formulæ.

Their utter rejection of sacerdotalism, ritualism, and all forms of ceremonialism has put them out of harmony with all religious parties that stand for sacerdotal and ritualistic practices.

As regards the set of doctrines on which Augustin differed from his theological predecessors, and modern Calvinists from Arminians, Baptists have always been divided. The medieval evangelical sects were all, apparently, anti-Augustinian, and the Baptist parties of the sixteenth century followed in the footsteps of their medieval spiritual ancestors in this and other important particulars. Those Baptist parties of modern times whose historical relations with the medieval evangelical parties and the antipedobaptist parties of the sixteenth century are most intimate have

rejected the Calvinistic system; while those that owe their origin to English Puritanism, with Wiclifism and Lollardism behind it and with the deeply rooted Calvinism of the English Elizabethan age as its leading characteristic, have been noted for their staunch adherence to Calvinistic principles, not, of course, because of any supposed authority of Calvin or of the English Puritan leaders, but because they have seemed to them to be Scriptural. Calvinistic and Arminian Baptists have both had periods of extreme development, the former sometimes scarcely escaping fatalism and antinomianism, the latter sometimes falling into Socinian denial of the deity of Christ and Pelagian denial of original sin. The great majority of the Baptists of to-day hold to what may be called moderate Calvinism, or Calvinism tempered with the evangelical anti-Augustinianism which came through the Moravian Brethren to Wesley and by him was brought powerfully to bear on all bodies of evangelical Christians.

Baptists are at one with the great Congregational body and with most of the minor denominations as regards church government. Holding firmly to the universal priesthood of believers, they insist upon the equality of rights and privileges of all church-members, but follow the New Testament precept and example in so far differentiating the functions of the members as to bring into effectiveness the gifts and graces of each and to provide for the watch-care and edification of the entire body and for the extension of the kingdom of Christ through properly directed effort. The officers of the congregation not only owe their appointment to the voté of the entire church, but hold their positions only so long as seems good to the church. Some of the antipedobaptist parties of the sixteenth century, following in the footsteps of their spiritual ancestors of the medieval time (Waldenses, Bohe-

mian Brethren, etc.), adopted a system of general superintendency, as did the Moravian Brethren and the Methodists in more recent times under similar influences. Regarding themselves as essentially a missionary church, and being under the stress of almost continuous persecution, they felt the need of strong administrative heads for the direction of missionary effort, for administering the resources of the connection in times of persecution and distress, and for guarding the body from the inroads of error. But English and American Baptists have been from the first, with trifling exceptions, ardent advocates of independency, and this principle has at times been so overemphasized as to interfere seriously with concerted action of any kind, and with the growth of denominational spirit. It is only within the last hundred years that Baptists have come to realize the power there is in associated effort in home and foreign missionary work, in education, in publication, etc. Baptists believe that through their conventions, associations, advisory councils, missionary, publication, and educational boards, with their efficient administrative officers, they have secured, without in any way interfering with the autonomy of the individual congregations, most of the advantages of prelatical and presbyterial organization.

The attitude of Baptists toward Christian union is often misconceived and adversely judged by their brethren of other denominations. Baptists earnestly desire Christian union, and believe that it will come in due time; but they insist that efforts for union, to be permanently effective, must be along the line of a better understanding of the word of God and more complete loyalty thereto, rather than along the line of compromise. They are themselves anxious to be instructed in the word of God more perfectly, and are ready to abandon any position that can be shown to be out of harmony with apostolic precept or ex-

ample. That the scholars of all denominations, including Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, and Reformed, are so nearly in agreement as regards the leading features of the apostolic church, including the nature of church organization, the character and functions of church officers, the number and character of the ordinances, etc., and that the consensus of scholarship is so nearly in accord with the traditional Baptist interpretation of Scripture, is highly gratifying to Baptists, and encourages them to believe that the development of Christian life and practice will be in the direction of greater uniformity, and that the church of the future will more and more approximate the Baptist position. This they desire only so far as the Baptist position shall be proved by the best Christian scholarship to be the Scriptural position.

III. ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL ANTIPEDOBAPTISTS.

The claim of Baptists that their doctrine and polity are in substantial accord with the precept and example of Christ and his apostles would seem to make it incumbent on their historian to explain the early departure of the great mass of Christians from the apostolic standard. Christianity arose in the midst of religious ferment. The philosophies and theosophies of the East were never more active and aggressive than during the first three Christian centuries. Before the close of the apostolic age Gnosticism in some of its most dangerous forms was seriously threatening the life of the churches. Belief in the magical efficacy of external rites was a universal feature of paganism, and the corrupted Judaism of the early Christian age coöperated with theosophical paganism in fixing this feature on the early churches. Sacerdotalism goes hand in hand with ceremonialism, and the pagan idea of

the priest as a mediator between God and man and as the exclusive manipulator of magical religious ceremonies was not long in making its impression on the Christian churches. A careful comparison of the Christian literature of the second and third centuries with the New Testament writings cannot fail to reveal the transformation of the church in doctrine and life under pagan influence.

Early in the second century the idea became prevalent that while instruction in Christian truth and morals, repentance, faith, fasting, and prayer must precede baptism, the remission of sins takes place only in connection with the baptismal act. Such is the teaching of the "Pastor" of Hermas (about A.D. 139) and of Justin Martyr (about A.D. 150). By the close of the second century the pagan view that water baptism possesses in itself magical efficacy begins to find expression. "Is it not wonderful, too," writes Tertullian, "that death should be washed away by bathing?" To justify such ascription of efficacy to water baptism he expatiates on the age and the dignity of water. "Water was the first to produce that which had life, that it might be no wonder in baptism if water know how to give life." "All waters, therefore, in virtue of the pristine privilege of their origin, do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification." In the Gnostic "Pistis Sophia," Christ is represented as saying: "If any one hath received the mysteries of baptism, those mysteries become a great fire, exceeding strong and wise, so as to burn up all the sins," etc. The Ebionitic writer of the "Clementine Recognitions" thus represents the effects of baptism: "If, therefore, any one be found smeared with sins and lusts as with pitch, the fire easily gets the mastery of him. But if the tow be not steeped in the pitch of sin, but in the water of purification and regeneration, the fire of the demons shall not be able to kindle in it."

With such passages, of which many more might be quoted, may be compared the following from the orthodox Cyprian: "For as scorpions and serpents, which prevail on the dry ground, when cast into the water cannot prevail nor retain their venom, so also the wicked spirits . . . cannot remain any longer in the body of a man in whom, baptized and sanctified, the Holy Spirit is beginning to dwell."

Side by side with the idea of the efficacy of water baptism there had grown up among Christians the conviction that apart from baptism there is no salvation even for unconscious infants. This conviction seems first to have found expression in Gnostic and Ebionitic writings, but it had become pretty general before the middle of the third century. In the "Clementine Recognitions" (vi. 8, 9), Peter is represented as saying: "And do you suppose that you can have hope toward God, even if you cultivate all piety and all righteousness, but do not receive baptism? . . . When you are regenerated and born again of water and of God, the frailty of your former birth, which you have through men, is cut off, and so at length you shall be able to attain salvation; but otherwise it is impossible. . . . Betake yourselves, therefore, to these waters, for they alone can quench the violence of the future fire. . . . For whether you be righteous or unrighteous, baptism is necessary for you in every respect: for the righteous, that perfection may be accomplished in him, and he may be born again to God; for the unrighteous, that pardon may be vouchsafed him for the sins he has committed in ignorance."

Infant baptism was the inevitable result of the twofold conviction that infants are so affected with the guilt of the race as to be subject to damnation in case of death without baptism, and that baptism possesses magical efficacy to secure salvation. At first it would naturally be confined

to infants in imminent danger of death; but those who had the keenest realization of the horrors of hell and the virtue of baptism were not content to run the risk of the sudden death of their offspring, and so the practice grew apace. It was somewhat impeded in its progress, however, by the rise and growth of another error, namely, that post-baptismal sins are irremissible. It was on this ground, and on this alone, that Tertullian pleaded so earnestly for the postponement of baptism until such a degree of maturity and stability should have been reached as would warrant the expectation that the candidate would be able to guard himself from the commission of mortal sins. On this ground some went to the opposite extreme of postponing baptism until near the end of life. Thus one could be assured of entering heaven with a clean score. The rigid view of Tertullian as regards the unpardonableness of post-baptismal sins gradually gave place to a more benignant view, and from the middle of the third century the church made such provision for the restoration of the lapsed that infant baptism came to be regarded by most as the safer thing.

The Lord's Supper suffered a similar perversion, and, largely through Gnostic influence, ceased to be regarded as a memorial feast in which believers held communion with one another and with their risen Lord, and assumed the character of a mystic rite celebrated with elaborate ceremonial.

The growth of sacerdotalism has already been referred to. The process by which the simple congregational church government of the apostolic time developed into the hierarchical government of the third and following centuries, when bishops claimed to rule by divine right and to be irresponsible, cannot here be detailed.

No less destructive of the spirit of primitive Christianity

was the early intrusion of the doctrine of the meritoriousness of external works. Jews and pagans alike attached merit to almsgiving, fasting, and the utterance of fixed forms of prayer. By the middle of the third century leading churchmen like Cyprian did not hesitate to urge almsgiving as a means of securing the remission of sins and of purchasing an everlasting inheritance.

Asceticism, also, was imported into early Christianity from paganism. The disposition to regard the body as intrinsically evil, and all natural impulses as worthy only of being trampled upon, is a well-known feature of pagan religions. Fanatical seeking for martyrdom, excessive fasting, and exaltation of virginity were the earliest forms of Christian asceticism. It was chiefly through Gnosticism and Manichæism that ascetical ideas found entrance into the church. By the fourth century they had become dominant.

These facts are mentioned here to show that the perversion of the ordinances in the early church was no isolated phenomenon, and that Baptists are not presumptuous in rejecting ecclesiastical practices which can be traced back even as far as the second or third century.

But, it may be asked, did the church as a whole succumb to these corrupting influences? Were there none that remained loyal to primitive Christianity among the tempted multitudes? Some Baptist writers have sought to find in the Montanists, Novatians, Donatists, Jovinianists, Vigilantians, Paulicians, Bogomiles, etc., who successively revolted from the dominant type of Christianity, and in the ancient British churches that long refused obedience to the pope, adherents to apostolic doctrine and practice and links in the chain of Baptist apostolic succession. It may suffice here to say that while some of these parties were more and some less evangelical than the church they

antagonized, no one of them can be proved to have held to Baptist views as to the nature and subjects of baptism.

Was there, then, a failure of the assurance of Christ that the gates of Hades should not prevail against his church? Far be it! We are not able to prove, it is true, that from the close of the apostolic age to the twelfth century a single congregation existed that was in every particular true to the apostolic norm; but that there were hosts of true believers even during the darkest and most corrupt periods of Christian history does not admit of a doubt. That a church may make grave departures in doctrine and practice from the apostolic standard without ceasing to be a church of Christ must be admitted, or else it must be maintained that during long periods no church is known to have existed. In this admission there is no implication that an individual or a church can knowingly live in disobedience to Christ's precepts without grievous sin, or can ignorantly disobey without serious spiritual loss. On the contrary, every departure, conscious or unconscious, from apostolic precept or example not only involves loss as regards the particular defection, but brings in its train other evils, which in turn bring others, until doctrine and practice become thoroughly corrupt.

Not until we reach the twelfth century do we encounter types of Christian life that we can with any confidence recognize as Baptist. Among the dissenting parties which flourished at that time in the south of France we meet with Peter de Bruys and Henry of Lausanne, both of whom took a firm stand in favor of the restoration of primitive Christianity and for many years propagated their views with great success throughout extensive regions. Referring to the work of Peter de Bruys in a certain region, Peter the Venerable, a contemporary, wrote: "In your parts the people are rebaptized, the churches pro-

fanned, the altars overthrown, crosses burned; on the very day of our Lord's passion flesh is publicly eaten; priests are scourged; monks are imprisoned and compelled by terrors and tortures to marry." The scourging and torturing are non-Baptist features, but the writer bears witness at least to the utter helplessness of priests and monks in the presence of Peter's fiery zeal. Elsewhere he sums up the errors of the evangelists under five heads. "The first article of the heretics denies that children who have not reached the age of intelligence can be saved by baptism, nor (*sic*) that another person's faith can profit those who cannot use their own, since our Lord says, 'Whosoever shall have believed and shall have been baptized shall be saved.'" He charges them, furthermore, with denying the real presence in the eucharist. The rest of the charges are in entire accord with the Baptist position. Peter labored from 1104 to 1128, and Henry from 1116 to 1148. The popularity of the latter was wonderful, and multitudes were turned by him from the dominant church.

We have accounts of similar antipedobaptist movements in Breton, the Netherlands, and the Rhine region during the first half of the twelfth century. Evervin, in a letter to Bernard, refers to "certain other heretics in our land [the vicinity of Cologne], absolutely discordant from these [the Cathari], through whose mutual discord and contention both have been detected by us. These latter deny that the body of Christ is made at the altar. . . . Concerning the baptism of little children they have no faith, because of that passage in the gospel, 'Whosoever shall have believed and shall have been baptized shall be saved.'" It is probable that Arnold of Brescia, the great Italian reformer of the same century, rejected infant baptism. If so, his position was almost identical with that of Peter de Bruys and Henry of Lausanne, with whom

he may have come in contact. The statement of Otto of Freising, one of the best informed of his contemporaries, "He [Arnold] is said to have been astray with reference to the sacrament of the altar and the baptism of infants," is amply confirmed as to the first charge and uncontradicted as to the second.

The early Waldenses (1178 onward) were believers in transubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, and infant baptism. Under the influence of more evangelical parties, most or all of them came to reject transubstantiation and consubstantiation alike, and some of them, probably a minority, became antipedobaptists.

Peter Chelcicky, the spiritual father of the Bohemian Brethren, and one of the ablest evangelical thinkers of the fifteenth century, closely approached in his doctrinal system the position reached by the antipedobaptists of the sixteenth century. Like the later Waldenses, he rejected the doctrines of the real presence and baptismal regeneration, and sought to make the New Testament the standard of his faith and practice. Any departure from the apostolic model, by way of addition or diminution, he considered apostasy. God's law is perfectly sufficient in every particular. Any union of church and state he regarded as fraught with evil. If the entire population of a state were Christian, there would be no need of civil government. A Christian state he regarded as anomalous. In the so-called Christian state there is no place for the true Christian except in the lowest ranks. All dominion, all class distinctions, are radically opposed to Christ's requirement of brotherly equality. No true Christian can be a king or a civil officer. Christians should avoid trade, as involving deceit in seeking advantages. He insisted on the freedom of the will, yet recognized the necessity of divine grace in regeneration. Oaths and capital punish-

ment he rejected with the utmost decision. As regards baptism, after quoting the great commission, he proceeds: "Open and clear is the word of the Son of God: first he speaks of faith, then of baptism; . . . and since we find this doctrine in the gospel we should now also hold fast to it. But the priests err greatly in baptizing the great mass, and no one is found, whether old or young, who knows God and believes his Scripture. . . . Baptism belongs to those who know God and believe his Scripture." It is rather disappointing to find him adding, "If such have children, baptism should be bestowed upon their children in their conscience."

The Bohemian Brethren (*Unitas Fratrum*) practiced re-baptism in receiving members from the Roman Catholic and Hussite Churches until 1537, when they reluctantly abandoned it to escape the penalties to which Anabaptists were by law amenable. Like the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren were divided in respect to infant baptism. In an apology and two confessions addressed (1503-04) to King Wladislaus, they admit that some among them have rejected infant baptism.

There is no decisive evidence that any party in England rejected infant baptism before the Reformation time, although a vigorous evangelical movement was carried forward there before and after the time of Wiclif.

The medieval evangelical movements are of interest to the student of Baptist history not simply on account of the antipedobaptist features that appear in connection with the most important of them, but still more because of the type of life and teaching which was to reappear in nearly all its features in the antipedobaptist parties of the sixteenth century. The stress laid on the imitation of Christ and on the Sermon on the Mount, the maintenance of freedom of the will, insistence on holy living as a

necessary expression of true faith, rejection of oaths, warfare, capital punishment, and the exercise of magistracy on the part of Christians, are common to medieval evangelical parties and to the various antipedobaptist parties of the Reformation time.

It is estimated that there were at the beginning of the sixteenth century between 300 and 400 congregations of Bohemian Brethren in Moravia and Bohemia, with a constituency of about 200,000. These had the support and protection of many of the most powerful noblemen. In the Alpine valleys of southeastern France and northwestern Italy the Waldenses (Vaudois) continued to exist in large numbers. It is estimated that they had at this period about 100 congregations, with a constituency of about 100,000. Scattered throughout the rest of Europe there were Waldensian congregations, the number of whose constituents may have reached 100,000 more.

During the years immediately preceding the Lutheran revolt from the papacy, these evangelical Christians were active in the circulation of vernacular Bibles and other evangelical literature.

IV. THE ANABAPTISTS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

The Anabaptist movement of the sixteenth century had its roots in the evangelical parties of the middle ages, to which it owed its modes of thought, its type of Christian life, and its methods of work. To the peculiar circumstances of the time it owed most of the features that differentiate it from the earlier movements. The term "Anabaptist" was applied indiscriminately to all who, dissenting from the dominant forms of Protestantism and from Roman Catholicism, insisted on setting up separate

churches for the embodiment and propagation of their views. To the dominant parties, Thomas Münzer, the mystical fanatic and socialistic agitator, who never submitted to nor administered rebaptism, who persisted in baptizing infants, and who sought to set up the kingdom of Christ by carnal warfare, the scholarly and soundly Scriptural Hubmaier, the intellectual and spiritual mystic, Denck, and the chiliastic fanatics of Münster, were all alike Anabaptists, and even the most Christ-like of these were treated as criminals of the deepest dye. There was some excuse for this confusion in the fact that most of those to whom the epithet was applied denied the Scriptural authorization of infant baptism, and made baptism on a profession of faith a condition of entering into their fellowship.

The beginning of the sixteenth century was a time of unrest and expectancy. A spirit of revolution was abroad. Enough of evangelical light and enough of the spirit of freedom had been diffused among the oppressed masses to insure among them an enthusiastic reception for any movement that should give fair promise of relief from priestcraft and of social amelioration. When Luther denounced indulgences and afterward went on assailing, one after another, the corruptions and errors of the Roman Catholic Church, those who had come under the influence of the evangelical movements of the earlier time felt that now at last the day of deliverance had come, and rallied to his support. Luther's bold proclamation of the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures, of the universal priesthood of believers, and of the right of each individual Christian to interpret the Scriptures for himself, and his repudiation of "whatever falls short of, is apart from, or goes beyond Christ," must have produced a strong impression on those who had been long listening for such a

mighty leader to voice their sentiments. It was natural that when Luther began to draw back, in deference to the views of the civil rulers and from fear of disastrous revolution, the radical reformers that had taken him at his word should refuse to conform to his moderated scheme, and should set themselves in opposition to what they considered a temporizing policy. It was natural, also, that Luther, when he felt that the evangelical cause was jeopardized by the radicals, should have counseled their violent suppression.

The first note of revolt in Germany was sounded at Zwickau, where Thomas Münzer had become pastor of a leading church. Under the influence of Nicholas Storch, a master weaver, who had apparently come in contact with a chiliastic Bohemian party, and who possessed a wonderful knowledge of the letter of Scripture and knew how to interpret the prophecies with reference to his own time, Münzer was led to proclaim the setting up of the kingdom of Christ, with the overthrow of the existing order. Münzer, Storch, and a number of their followers regarded themselves as prophets, and claimed to be commissioned to lead in the establishment of a reign of righteousness and equality. After some iconoclastic procedures at Zwickau, a number of the prophets visited Wittenberg with the hope of winning to their support the evangelical leaders. Carlstadt, the rector of the university, and Celarius, one of the leading scholars, recognized their claims and accepted their views. Melancthon was powerfully moved, but turned to Luther, then in retirement at the Wartburg, for counsel. Luther left his retirement and by a mighty effort succeeded in checking the movement. The labors of Storch and Münzer during the next few years, and the violent fanaticism of Münzer and his followers, aided in arousing the social democracy of Germany to re-

volt, and in convincing many that the kingdom of God would be set up by a mighty display of divine power in connection with the swords of the faithful. Storch rejected infant baptism and established several congregations of baptized believers. Münzer retained infant baptism, after declaring it to be unscriptural, and devoted his energies almost exclusively to arousing the masses to revolt. The part which he played in the Peasants' War, the massacre of his deluded followers, and his own subsequent execution are sufficiently familiar. Storch is to be regarded as the father of the chiliastic Anabaptist movement, whose later history was so fraught with disaster.

This blending of antipedobaptist views with chiliastic reveries and with socialistic and revolutionary aims and procedures was most unfortunate, and caused antipedobaptists of all types to be regarded as the enemies of civil and religious order.

A radical movement of a widely different type we meet in Switzerland from 1523 onward. Zwingli was an advanced humanist, and had no sympathy with the ascription of magical efficacy to external rites. His efforts at reform were directed largely against the superstitious practices of the Roman Church, and so general was anti-papal feeling in republican Switzerland that the reformation of idolatrous abuses met with little opposition. Cool-headed, clear-headed, a good scholar, an able theologian, a skillful debater, an adroit politician, he aimed at political and social reform almost as much as at religious. In a disputation with representatives of the Bishop of Constance in 1523, he set forth his views in sixty-seven articles, and overwhelmed his opponents. In the elaboration of the eighteenth article he called attention to the fact that in the early church catechetical instruction preceded baptism. He persistently denied that infants are saved

by baptism or lost through lack of it. Zwingli's type of reform rapidly spread over a large part of Switzerland and into the adjoining German and Austrian provinces. From 1521 onward, Balthasar Hubmaier, one of the ablest theologians and most eloquent preachers of the time, was chief pastor at Waldshut in the Austrian Breisgau, having left a highly influential position in Regensburg on account of his adoption of evangelical views. In 1523 he conversed with Zwingli on the baptism of infants, and Zwingli agreed with him in holding that it was without Scriptural authorization and ought in time to be abolished. Hubmaier kept his antipedobaptist views in abeyance for some time, and by his clear and strong evangelical teaching gained such an ascendancy as enabled him to carry with him the influential elements of the population in the adoption of believers' baptism.

In the meantime a radical party had appeared in the canton of Zürich. Reformatory measures were pressed forward vigorously by Zwingli, but he was hampered by the civil authorities and dared not proceed as fast as the radicals demanded. These violated fasts and threw down images before they were authoritatively abolished. They refused to pay tithes and agitated for agrarian reform. A body of earnest Christian scholars had gathered around Zwingli, who sought to impress upon him the importance of completing the reformation of the church and the inadmissibility of allowing the measure of reform to be dictated by the ungodly magistracy. That the unregenerate should be admitted to the Lord's Supper along with the regenerate seemed to them contrary to apostolic precept and example. Zwingli admitted the desirableness of most of the reforms that they urged, but could not be persuaded to ignore the magistracy. Unable longer to have fellowship with a partially reformed church, and convinced that

Zwingli was sinfully temporizing, Grebel, Manz, Blaurock, and others withdrew, and organized a church of believers on the basis of believers' baptism (December, 1524). When Zwingli saw the connection of antipedobaptism with the setting up of separate churches and the dissolution of the ecclesiastical establishment, he at once became a zealous advocate of infant baptism. The antipedobaptist movement spread with great rapidity in the canton of Zürich, and thence to Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Berne, Basle, and the Graubünden. Severe persecution for a time seemed rather to further the movement than to hinder its progress. In St. Gall and its vicinity thousands were baptized in a few weeks (April and May, 1525).

Hubmaier, with Roßbli's help, introduced believers' baptism at Waldshut (about Easter, 1525), and the town authorities, supported by the people, incurred the wrath of the Austrian government for refusing to deliver him up. When obliged to leave Waldshut (December, 1525) he took refuge in Zürich, where with Zwingli's approval he was thrown into prison, and if not technically tortured (as seems probable), was subjected to the most distressing hardships. Exterminating persecution dispersed the Swiss antipedobaptists throughout Europe. Hubmaier took refuge in Moravia (July, 1526), where he won some noblemen to the support of his cause, and for about a year and a half (1526-27) built up a strong church and produced and published an extensive denominational literature.

In Silesia, partly through the influence of Nicholas Storch, partly through the activity of Caspar Schwenckfeldt, an influential nobleman who had adopted antipedobaptist views, but was prevented by his mysticism from taking a strong position in favor of believers' baptism, and still more through the influence of the Swiss antipedobaptist movement, a large part of the population came to

reject infant baptism. Persecution drove Schwenckfeldt from the country in 1528, and Gabriel Ascherham (Schärding), one of the ablest and soundest of the antipedobaptist leaders, led thousands of his followers to Moravia, which had become the land of promise for the persecuted Anabaptist hosts.

In Styria and the Tyrol antipedobaptist views met with the most eager acceptance, and, notwithstanding the persistent efforts of the Austrian authorities to exterminate them, Anabaptists long carried on a vigorous propaganda in these provinces. One of the most famous of the Tyrolese preachers was Jacob Huther, who became a leader of the chief Moravian party, but afterward suffered martyrdom in his native land. These Austrian provinces had been nurseries of evangelical life during the later middle ages, and the very localities where Waldenses had flourished became centers of Anabaptist activity.

Augsburg was one of the chief commercial centers of the sixteenth century, and was a refuge for persecuted Anabaptists from 1525 to 1530. In no locality was there a greater aggregation or a greater variety of Anabaptist life. Chiliasts of the Storch and Münzer type and Swiss Anabaptists were both alike early on the ground; but the first to attempt an organization of the heterogeneous Anabaptist mass was Hans Denck, who may be regarded as, next to Hubmaier, the most important of the early Anabaptist leaders. Closely associated with him in evangelistic work and in oriental studies and Bible translation was Ludwig Hätzer. Under Hubmaier's influence, organization was effected in the summer of 1526. Denck left Augsburg after a few months, and the leadership fell upon Hans Hut, a disciple of Münzer and a chiliast of the most pronounced type, who, however, had been baptized by Denck. The activity and influence of Hut are aston-

ishing. Making Augsburg his center, he labored in Moravia, upper Austria, and throughout southern Germany. So irresistible was his influence over the oppressed masses that a few hours' stay in a place often resulted in the establishment of a community pledged to his principles. There can be little doubt that he encouraged the people to expect in the near future a mighty manifestation of divine power for their deliverance, and gave secret instructions to his followers to be prepared to smite the ungodly when the appointed time should come.

Denck's type of teaching was perpetuated in Augsburg by Eitelhans Langenmantel, a member of one of the chief patrician families, who published largely in defense of antipedobaptist principles and against the corrupt practices of the time.

Denck returned to Augsburg about September, 1527, and once more placed his strong hand on the helm. There are said to have been at least eleven hundred Anabaptists in the city about this time. Shortly after Denck's return a great gathering of Anabaptist leaders is supposed to have occurred in Augsburg. Persecution of a violent type soon followed. Denck departed, and died soon afterward at the house of his friend Oecolampadius. Hut died in prison, and a number of executions followed. In Swabia, Bavaria, and Franconia, exterminating measures were enacted in February, 1528. The sanguinary imperial edict of Speier followed in April, 1529.

The Strassburg authorities were even more tolerant than those of Augsburg, and the city has been called an Eldorado of the persecuted. The evangelical ministers were exceptionally liberal. Bucer for some time declined to persecute those who quietly rejected infant baptism; Zell could never be induced to repudiate or refuse hospitality to any man who recognized Christ as his Lord and

Saviour; while Capito could scarcely be restrained from becoming an avowed antipedobaptist. Every type of antipedobaptist life had its representatives in this center. During 1526 vast numbers of persecuted Anabaptists from all parts of Alsace, southern Germany, and Switzerland streamed into the city. Here also Denck and Hätzer resided for some months, and produced a marked impression. Among other noted leaders may be mentioned Jacob Gross, a disciple of Hubmaier; Michael Sattler, one of the ablest and most amiable of the antipedobaptists of the Swiss school; Wilhelm Rößli, one of the earliest and most zealous evangelists of the time; Jacob Kautz, a brilliant preacher who went beyond Denck in the mystical character of his teaching; Pilgram Marbeck, a Tyrolese engineer, whose social position and whose devotion to antipedobaptist principles were of the highest value to the cause; and Melchior Hofmann, a Swabian furrier, whose influence was to prove disastrous.

After the issuing of the edict of Speier the Strassburg authorities felt obliged to take measures for the suppression of the deeply rooted antipedobaptist movement. Many were banished, some were tortured, but the Strassburg authorities were strongly averse to shedding innocent blood.

The Landgrave Philip of Hesse was, with all his moral delinquencies, by far the most tolerant of all the princes of Germany. In spite of the entreaties and remonstrances of such neighboring princes as John George of Saxony, and of such Protestant leaders as Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer, he steadfastly refused to deal severely with the people everywhere spoken against. It is remarkable that of the two thousand or more Anabaptists executed up to 1530, not one had suffered in Hesse. In 1529, in response to a remonstrance from the elector of Saxony, he wrote:

"We are still unable at the present time to find it in our conscience to have any one executed with the sword on account of his faith." Even after the Münster catastrophe, when other princes were slaughtering Anabaptists indiscriminately, he insisted on making a distinction between fanatics and evangelical advocates of believers' baptism. "To punish capitally . . . those who have done nothing more than err in the faith cannot indeed be justified on gospel grounds," he wrote at this time.

The most noted and influential leader of the Hessian Anabaptists was Melchior Rink, a man of splendid scholarship and noble character, but unfortunately involved in the millenarian errors of Storch and Münzer. He was many times arrested, and his life was demanded by the Saxon princes and theologians, but Philip had strength enough to protect him from his enemies.

At Nikolsburg in Moravia, Hubmaier labored for a year and a half with astonishing success. The Counts Leonard and John of Lichtenstein accepted his views and received baptism at his hands. The principal evangelical preachers in the territory of the Lichtensteins, including one who had been a Roman Catholic bishop, were also convinced of the truth of Hubmaier's teaching, and became his coadjutors. A printing-press was established and Hubmaier's works were widely circulated. Hut soon appeared on the scene and won some to his millenarianism and his rejection of magistracy and warfare. Communism was championed by Jacob Wiedemann, and after Hubmaier's martyrdom (1528) became the dominant type of Anabaptist teaching in Moravia. Notwithstanding frequent bitter persecution, the Moravian Anabaptists by their skill and industry made themselves indispensable to the Moravian nobles, and their strong communistic organization enabled them to husband their resources for ag-

gressive work in the neighboring countries, and even in times of severe persecution to hold together. The disadvantages of communism need not here be dwelt upon. Under Jacob Huther (1529 onward) the communistic element became dominant, and the party soon came to be known as Hutherites. At the beginning of the Thirty Years' War (1618) they numbered about 70,000, and were highly prosperous. War and the Jesuits nearly wrought their extermination. In the latter part of the eighteenth century a few families removed from Transylvania to Russia. In 1874 the entire community emigrated to America and settled in what is now South Dakota. They have five congregations, with a membership of 352. (See vol. i. of the present series, p. 213.)

By 1530 nearly all of the Anabaptist leaders of the earlier time had been destroyed. Persecution had become so fierce and so general that apart from Moravia there was scarcely a place of refuge. The chiliastic teachings of Hut and Rink had found eager acceptance among the pious people, who were coming to despair of the triumph of the truth through ordinary means, and who were driven to the belief that God would miraculously interpose for the deliverance of the godly and for the destruction of the ungodly. This view received extensive currency through the remarkable activity of Melchior Hofmann. After an eventful career as a Lutheran (1523-29) in Livonia, Sweden, Denmark, etc., where he created great commotion by his fiery denunciations of the corruptions of the time, and his proclamation of the approaching divine judgment, he adopted the Carlstadt-Zwinglian view of the Supper, and in company with Carlstadt journeyed through the Netherlands and reached Strassburg in June, 1529. In East Friesland a controversy was raging between Lutherans and Zwinglians, and he and Carlstadt

gave much encouragement and help to the Zwinglian party, which soon became triumphant. He was equipped with a remarkable knowledge of the letter of Scripture, and with a mastery of the allegorical method of interpretation. He had long been a pronounced chiliast, and he had already reached the conclusion that Christ's human nature was not derived from Mary, but was essentially divine. Contact with the Anabaptists of Strassburg led to his conversion to antipedobaptist views. He soon found those who sympathized with him in his chiliastic and other errors, although it may be supposed that those antipedobaptists who had been trained in the school of Denck, and those who were at this time under the influence of the soundly evangelical Pilgram Marbeck, would give little heed to such vagaries. The prophetic spirit appeared among his followers, and in 1530 he published a modern prophecy with an interpretation of Revelation xii., which the authorities regarded as treasonable. During the next three years, by his writings and his evangelistic efforts, he gained multitudes of converts throughout the Netherlands, Westphalia, and the lower Rhenish provinces. In 1531 the Hofmannites suffered severe persecution in the Netherlands, and Jan Trijpmaker, Hofmann's most influential disciple, was put to death. Hofmann now promulgated an order that baptism be suspended for two years, with the intimation that at the end of this period there would be a wonderful manifestation of divine power on behalf of the lovers of the truth. The effect of this fixing of the date of Christ's advent was wonderful. His disciples were filled with the enthusiasm of those who are assured that they have a great mission to perform, and that the time is strictly limited. From this time onward the growth of the party in the Netherlands was rapid. Lutheranism and Zwinglianism almost vanished. Throughout West-

phalia, Hesse, Cleves-Jülich, and other neighboring provinces this type of teaching was rapidly propagated.

In 1533 one of Hofmann's disciples had prophesied that he should return to Strassburg, suffer six months' imprisonment, and then lead the lovers of the truth to universal victory. He returned to Strassburg and was thrown into prison, where he died ten years later. There is something truly pathetic in the history of his prophecies and his disappointments. Again and again he fixed the date of the inauguration of the glorious kingdom, and sought to explain the preceding failures. Hofmann was undoubtedly an exceedingly able and a profoundly pious man, and to his honor it must be said that he did not counsel resort to violence. But he awakened a chiliastic enthusiasm that was sure to lead to the horrors of Münster.

Before the imprisonment of Hofmann a still more influential leader had appeared in the person of one of his Dutch disciples, Jan Matthys by name. Hofmann seems to have announced (1531) to the faithful that he himself was Elias; Enoch would appear later, and be revealed to the lovers of the truth; in two years the saints would gather at Strassburg, and to the number of 144,000 would go forth in the name of the Lord to set up his kingdom. As the end of 1533 drew near expectation was at its height, and the wildest excitement prevailed throughout the Hofmannite connection. Hofmann was in prison, and the people grew impatient. Matthys announced himself as the promised prophet, and ordered the resumption of baptism. A propaganda was now carried forward with the intensest enthusiasm. Multitudes were baptized throughout the regions of Hofmann's activity. In Matthys we see the spirit of Münzer revived, and that in an intensified form. He seems to have been consumed with

hatred of the upper classes, whom he regarded as the oppressors and persecutors of the poor people of God. To him God was in relation to the ungodly a God of vengeance. The dealing of Jehovah with the Canaanites through his chosen people was the basis of his idea of the way in which the new dispensation was to be ushered in. Christians were to take up arms, and to blot out the ungodly from the face of the earth.

Meanwhile an antipedobaptist movement of great power had been developed at Münster in Westphalia. This city had been a Roman Catholic stronghold. Protestantism of every type had been excluded with the utmost rigor. In 1529 Bernard Rothmann, a well-educated young clergyman, began to preach evangelical sermons at St. Mauritz, in the suburbs. His influence extended into the city, especially among the working-classes. His followers were able by 1530 to secure for him the use of one of the city churches. Under his leadership the social democracy of the city joined hands with the Lutherans, and the reform movement became so vigorous that in December, 1532, the unpopular bishop was driven from the city and many of his influential supporters imprisoned. The success of the evangelical movement aroused the wildest enthusiasm, not only in Münster, but also throughout the lower Rhenish provinces. Monasteries were closed, and priests were driven from the city. A number of able evangelical ministers from Cleves-Jülich and other provinces soon joined Rothmann in his reforming work. Among the most noted of these were Roll, Vinne, Klopriss, and Staprade. These all, with Rothmann, soon became avowed antipedobaptists. Rothmann at this time possessed a commanding influence. He had married the widow of a syndic, and had the full support of the council and the guilds. Controversy with the Lutherans followed. The council attempted to compel

the ministers to resume infant baptism. On their refusal an order was issued for the closing of their churches and the deposition of Rothmann. A great popular demonstration secured for Rothmann the privilege of preaching in another church on condition that he should refrain from referring to the matters in dispute. He consented to respect this requirement until he should receive some further intimation of the divine will with respect to the matter.

The news of the overthrow of Roman Catholicism in Münster and of the rapid growth of antipedobaptist sentiment awakened the profoundest interest among the Hoffmannite congregations. Early in January, 1534, two emissaries from Jan Matthys reached Münster and announced to the antipedobaptist leaders that Enoch had appeared in the person of Matthys, that the millennial kingdom was at hand, and that the baptized and redeemed should henceforth, under the dominion of Christ, lead a blessed life, with community of goods, without law, without magistracy, and without marriage. Rothmann, Roll, Vinne, and Stralen were baptized, and these baptized fourteen hundred others during the next eight days. These first emissaries from Matthys seem not to have fully expounded the program of their leader. On January 13th appeared two men specially commissioned by Matthys to remain in Münster and to take the leadership of the movement. These were John of Leyden and Gertom Kloster. The former was a gifted and enthusiastic young man of twenty-three. Rothmann and the older antipedobaptist ministers were henceforth the led rather than the leaders. The city authorities were powerless to stay this wild enthusiasm. The religious institutions were seized and Roman Catholics and Lutherans alike were compelled to leave the city. Persecution was renewed in the Netherlands in February. Learning of the success of his followers in Münster, Mat-

thys announced that it had been revealed to him that Münster and not Strassburg was the New Jerusalem. He dispatched messengers in all directions to order the faithful to meet at a particular time at some designated place. The command came to them as the voice of God. Multitudes left their homes, not knowing whither they went. Many were seized and executed on the way to Münster. Thousands reached the city of promise. Matthys himself was soon in Münster. The city was organized as a theocracy. Matthys is said to have proposed the slaughter of all the ungodly that remained in the city, but was opposed by Knipperdollinck, who had long been a leader of the social democracy, and whose influence in the new kingdom was great. The city was well fortified and was defended with the utmost determination. Messengers were sent out in every direction to proclaim the setting up of the kingdom of God in Münster. In April, Matthys was slain in attacking the besiegers. John of Leyden soon declared that he had received a divine command to be king, and he dare not disobey. Polygamy was introduced in obedience to another supposed divine intimation. A reign of terror ensued, in which the wildest license on the one hand and the most absolute despotism on the other prevailed. For more than a year the wretched fanatics were able to resist the bishop and his allies. At last the siege was broken and rebellion was suppressed in the most summary manner.

The Münster kingdom furnished an excuse for the intensifying of persecution throughout Europe. Persecution extended to Moravia, and for a time threatened utterly to destroy this flourishing branch of the antipedobaptist brotherhood.

Among Dutch antipedobaptists that refused to follow

the lead of Matthys were Dirk and Obbe Phillips and Leonard Bouwens, of East Friesland. Under the leadership of Menno Simons, supported by these brethren, the quiet antipedobaptists of the Netherlands, the lower Rhenish regions, and the regions bordering on the East Sea, were, after the Münster uproar, gathered into a firmly cemented union (1537 onward). Menno was a well-educated Catholic priest, who had become interested in Protestantism as early as 1523 and had been deeply impressed by the martyrdom of Sicke Frierichs, an Anabaptist, in 1531. As early as 1533 he seems to have entered into relations with the Anabaptists without abandoning his position as Roman Catholic priest. He used all his influence to dissuade the Anabaptists from the rash measures that culminated in the Münster kingdom. In 1536 he withdrew from the Catholic Church, and in the following year was led by the entreaties of the quiet Anabaptists, and his conviction of their sore need of help, to assume the leadership. The Mennonites, as the party afterward came to be called, repudiated with the utmost decision all fanatical and revolutionary measures, and denied any connection with the abominations of Münster. They adopted in almost every detail the principles and practices of the medieval Waldenses and Bohemian Brethren, along with a far more decided maintenance of believers' baptism. They enjoyed for some time a considerable measure of toleration in the Netherlands and neighboring regions, and soon grew into a strong party. Dissension arose chiefly in regard to discipline, and toward the close of the sixteenth and the early part of the seventeenth century Socinianism made a deep impression on the party; but notwithstanding much persecution and frequent schisms, Mennonism has maintained itself with slight changes, till

the present time, and still flourishes in the Old and in the New World.

As early as 1530 persecuted antipedobaptists from the Continent seem to have taken refuge in England and antipedobaptist literature to have been there in circulation. The terrible persecutions that preceded and followed the Münster kingdom drove multitudes of Dutch Anabaptists to England, where rapidly developing manufacturing enterprise offered to skilled Dutch artisans a welcome means of maintenance, while their strange tongue shielded them to some extent from persecution. A considerable number were detected from time to time, and executions and banishments were not infrequent; but it is certain that their numbers continued to be considerable and that they exerted an important influence on English evangelical life. Most of these earliest antipedobaptist refugees seem to have been of the Hofmannite type, as those who were arraigned before the authorities agreed in denying that Christ derived his humanity from Mary. Later refugees to England were chiefly Mennonites.

In Italy an important antitrinitarian antipedobaptist movement flourished from 1546 (or earlier) onward. Among the leaders were Camillo Renato, Francesco Negri, Pietro da Casali Maggiore, Tiziano, Iseppo of Asola, Celio Secundo Curio, Hieronimo Buzano, and Pietro Manelli. These were all educated men of high social position. Tiziano's views may be summed up as follows: (1) Insistence on believers' baptism; (2) rejection of magistracy as inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity; (3) maintenance of the symbolical and memorial nature of the sacraments; (4) exaltation of the Scriptures as the only criterion of the faith; (5) denunciation of the Roman Church as devilish and absolutely antichristian.

In 1550 about forty Anabaptist churches in northern Italy and the contiguous parts of Switzerland and Austria

were in fellowship with each other and enjoyed together the services of a general superintendent. At this date these churches were much agitated over the question "whether Christ was God or man." Sixty delegates from about forty churches met in Venice for the settlement of this question. The Old and New Testaments were accepted as fundamental authority. Thrice during the meeting the Lord's Supper was solemnly celebrated. After forty days of earnest discussion an almost unanimous decision was reached against the deity of Christ, against the reality of good and evil angels, against the immortality of the godless and a place of future punishment, in favor of soul-sleeping, and against the propitiatory nature of Christ's sufferings.

Manelfi proved a traitor and delivered up his brethren to the Inquisition. Some escaped to Moravia, and having learned there the way of the Lord more perfectly returned and attempted to win their brethren to right doctrinal views.

The religious history of Poland is closely connected with that of Italy. The Italian thinkers who disseminated antitrinitarian views in Poland had doubtless been influenced by such antitrinitarian antipedobaptists as Tiziano, Curio, Negri, etc. So multifarious was the religious life of Poland during the second half of the sixteenth century that toleration was a necessity. Lutherans, Reformed, Bohemian Brethren, Anabaptists, and antitrinitarians existed side by side, each party having its supporters among the nobility. It may suffice here to say that antipedobaptist antitrinitarianism became, after a prolonged struggle, the dominant type of religion and was embodied in the Racovian Catechism, first published in 1605, but prepared some years earlier. This document contains an admirable definition of baptism, entirely in accord with the Baptist view. Infant baptism is repudiated, "since we have in

Scripture no command for, nor any example of," it. In answer to the question, "What, then, is to be thought of those who baptize infants?" the reply is, "You cannot correctly say that they baptize infants. For they do not *baptize* them—since this cannot be done without the immersion and ablution of the whole body in water, whereas they only lightly sprinkle their heads—this rite being not only erroneously applied to infants, but also, through this mistake, evidently changed."

It may here be remarked that Michael Servetus, the antitrinitarian martyr, was a most pronounced opponent of infant baptism.

This brief sketch of the antipedobaptist movements in the sixteenth century may suffice to give an idea of the character and the diversity of the religious life opprobriously designated "Anabaptist." The following remarks may prove helpful:

1. The parties designated "Anabaptist" agreed with each other and with the medieval evangelical parties in aiming to restore primitive Christianity, in laying stress upon the practical teachings of Christ himself (as in the Sermon on the Mount), in rejecting the Augustinian (Lutheran and Calvinistic) doctrinal system, including denial of freewill, justification by faith alone, etc., in rejecting oaths, warfare, capital punishment, and the exercise of magistracy by Christians. Hubmaier differed from most of his brethren as regards magistracy, warfare, etc.

2. Liberty of conscience was earnestly insisted upon by Hubmaier in a special treatise, and the violation of conscience was regarded by Anabaptists in general as abominable.

3. All agreed in rejecting infant baptism and in insisting upon believers' baptism, on the grounds that still prevail with Baptists.

4. Immersion was practiced at St. Gall, Augsburg, Strassburg, and by the antitrinitarian Anabaptists of Poland. But the common practice among the Swiss, Austrian, Moravian, and Dutch parties was affusion. The importance of immersion as the act of baptism seems to have been appreciated by few.

5. A number of speculative (mystical) thinkers combined with the views common to the various parties antitrinitarian and universalistic views, and some (as the Italian Anabaptists) became involved in the grossest doctrinal errors.

6. Even more baleful, if possible, was the influence of chiliasm, beginning with Storch and Münzer, transmitted through Hut and Rink, given wide currency by Hofmann, and fanned into fury by Matthys. Chiliasm has no logical connection with antipedobaptist principles and is likely to arise at any time among earnest men driven to despair by persecution. The great mass of those who took part in the Münster kingdom had adopted antipedobaptist views simply because they were presented to them in connection with a social scheme that promised relief from their burdens, the destruction of their oppressors, and a glorious earthly life. Under circumstances such as existed in 1533-35 chiliasm inevitably leads to fanaticism. It may well be questioned whether it is safe under any circumstances to tamper with a mode of religious thought in which so dire possibilities inhere. The extent to which the Baptist cause has been impeded by the Münster kingdom is incalculable. The Baptist name is odious throughout continental Europe to-day because of it. In England and in America the opponents of Baptists long urged their extermination on the ground that they might be expected to reenact the horrors of Münster.

V. THE ENGLISH GENERAL BAPTISTS.¹

The traditions according to which Baptist churches, as distinct from congregations of Dutch Mennonites, existed in England prior to 1609 seem to be unsupported by any evidence that the historian can accept. It is possible that some Welsh congregations of the ancient British type, or some Lollard congregations, practiced believers' baptism in the sixteenth century or earlier, but decisive evidence is wanting. Robert Browne, probably under Mennonite influence, adopted congregational views and insisted on liberty of conscience (1580 onward). He is said to have been intimately associated with the Dutch population of Norwich, among whom were many Mennonites, and it is probable that his church was composed in part of those who had been under Mennonite teaching. Persecution soon drove Browne and part of his congregation to Middelburg, Zeeland, where again he had ample opportunity to mature his views under Mennonite influence. The congregation was broken up by internal dissension, and Browne, probably losing his mental poise, returned to the Church of England and died in disgrace; but he had given currency among English evangelicals to principles that were to bear fruit, notwithstanding the defection of their annunciator. Other small separatist congregations were formed in London as early as 1587 or 1588. Severe persecution and the execution of Barrowe, Greenwood, and Penry, caused the exodus of many of the separatists to Holland (1593 onward), and a large congregation of English exiles was gathered in Amsterdam under Francis Johnson and Henry Ainsworth (1595 onward). It may

¹ See, on the General Baptists, Evans, Goadby, Taylor, Crosby, Ivimey, Barclay, Dexter ("John Smyth"), Hanbury, De Hoop Schaffler, Weingarten, and the Hanserd Knollys Society's publications, as in the Bibliography.

be remarked that Barrowe, Johnson, and Ainsworth, in different degrees, receded from the radical position of Browne as regards church government and liberty of conscience, adopting instead a semipresbyterian polity and recognizing the right of magistrates to suppress erroneous teaching and practice.

About 1602 John Smyth, a Cambridge graduate and one of the most scholarly men of his time, gathered a separatist church at Gainsborough. About 1606 pastor and congregation emigrated to Amsterdam and established themselves side by side with the older English congregation as the "Second English Church at Amsterdam." A modern writer¹ unfriendly to Smyth's principles thus characterizes him: "Clearly he was an impulsive man, with something magnetic in his popular sympathies and gifts strongly attaching his friends to himself; able to turn his hand to more than one thing; unselfish and charitable; punctilious and courageous; never ashamed to own any wrong in himself which he discovered; a good preacher, and a scholar of considerable acquirements—having, in short, many of the elements of a great and good man. On the other hand, his mind was restless, and perhaps his conscience morbidly sensitive to small matters," etc.

Before removing to Amsterdam Smyth had already embraced views of church polity nearer to those of Browne and of modern Congregationalists and Baptists than were those of Johnson or Ainsworth. In 1608 he came into controversy with the brethren of the older congregation with reference to the use of translations of the Bible in the worship of God. He objected to these on the ground that they were apocryphal and not the pure word of God. To meet his view every conductor of divine worship must

¹ Dexter, "John Smyth," p. 3. Much of the material here presented with reference to Smyth is derived from this scholarly work.

be so skilled in Greek and Hebrew as to be able to extemporize a translation for the benefit of the unlearned. He held that "reading out of a book . . . is no part of spiritual worship, but rather the invention of the man of sin"; that "in time of prophesying it is unlawful to have the book as a help before the eye"; and that "seeing singing a psalm is a part of spiritual worship, therefore it is unlawful to have the book before the eye in time of singing a psalm." "The triformed presbytery, consisting of three kinds of elders," he held to be "none of God's ordinance, but man's device"; he maintained that "lay elders (so called) are antichristian"; and insisted that "in contributing to the church treasury there ought to be both a separation from them that are without and a sanctification of the whole action by prayer and thanksgiving."

In most of these points Smyth undoubtedly made a wrong and impracticable application of principles; but underlying all was the profound conviction of the sole authority of Scripture as it was divinely given, and of the necessity of eliminating from the worship of God everything non-spiritual.

Early in 1609 (N. S.) Smyth reached the conviction that infant baptism, as lacking Scriptural authorization, was to be rejected as a human invention that makes void an ordinance of Christ; nay, that it was a "mark of the beast." In this he had the sympathy and support of his church. Having reached the conviction that the church of Johnson and Ainsworth was "a false church, falsely constituted in the baptizing of infants and their own unbaptized estate," Smyth and his followers "dissolved their church, . . . and Mr. Smyth, being pastor thereof, gave over his office, as did also the deacons, and devised to enter into a new communion by renouncing their former baptism."

According to the unanimous testimony of contemporaries and his own apparent admission, Smyth first baptized himself, then Thomas Helwys, and afterward the rest of the company. It is almost certain that the rite was administered by affusion and not by immersion. His opponents make no reference to the form of the rite, which they would almost certainly have done if it had deviated from current practice; and the entire harmony of Smyth and his party in this matter with the Mennonites, who at this time practiced affusion, would seem decisive in favor of the supposition that they conformed to the common practice. The chief reproach that the opponents of Smyth and his brethren sought to cast upon the new organization was that of introducing baptism anew and of se-baptism.

The following is Smyth's answer to the reproach of instability: "To change a false religion is commendable and to retain a false religion is damnable. For a man of a Turk to become a Jew, of a Jew to become a Papist, of a Papist to become a Protestant, are all commendable changes though they all of them befall one and the same person in one year; nay, if it were in one month: so that not to change religion is evil simply; and therefore, that we should fall from the profession of Puritanism to Brownism, and from Brownism to true Christian baptism, is not simply evil or reprobable in itself, except it be proved that we have fallen from true religion; if we, therefore, being formerly deceived in the way of pedobaptistry, now do embrace the truth in the true Christian apostolic baptism, then let no man impute this as a fault unto us."

Smyth justified his act in instituting baptism anew on grounds entirely satisfactory to modern Baptists. He claimed that he and his followers had just as much right to "baptize themselves" as his opponents had "to set up a true church." "For if a true church," he proceeds,

"may be erected, which is the most noble ordinance of the New Testament, then much more baptism. . . . If they must recover them, men must begin so to do, and then two men joining together may make a church." He maintained that "any man raised up after the apostasy of antichrist, in the recovering of the church by baptism," may "administer it upon himself in communion with others." The necessity for this procedure lay in the fact "that there was no church to whom we could join with a good conscience to have baptism from them."

It is probable that Smyth's rejection of infant baptism was due in some measure to the influence of the Mennonites, who were numerous and well established in Amsterdam. A few months after the introduction of believers' baptism and the reorganization of the church, Smyth, unfortunately, became convinced that he had made a serious mistake in introducing baptism anew. Under the influence of the Socinianizing Mennonism of the time and place he adopted the Mennonite (Hofmannite) view of Christ's human nature, denied original sin and the imputation of Adam's sin, insisted that men are justified partly by their own inherent righteousness, and maintained that the church and ministry must come by succession, that an elder of one church is an elder of all churches in the world, and that magistrates may not be members of Christ's church and retain their magistracy. For these errors he and his followers were excluded by a majority of the church he had founded, under the leadership of Thomas Helwys and John Murton. The excluded members to the number of thirty-two made application to the Mennonite Church for admission, humbly confessing and repenting of their error in having undertaken "to baptize themselves contrary to the order laid down by Christ." Helwys and his party besought the Mennonite brethren to take wise counsel—

and that from God's word—"how you deal in this cause betwixt us and those that are justly for their sins cast out from us." The Mennonites had become exceedingly cautious from past experience, and postponed action until they could consult with brethren outside of Amsterdam. On various pretexts Smyth and his party were long refused admission. A Mennonite brother provided them with a meeting-place, and they continued to sustain friendly but not organic relations with the Mennonite Church until 1614, two years after Smyth's death.

Helwys and Murton took a most pronounced stand against Smyth's insistence on apostolic succession, declaring that succession "is antichrist's chief hold, and that it is Jewish and ceremonial, an ordinance of the Old Testament, but not of the New." "How dare any man or men," they add in their letter to the Mennonites from which the above is taken, "challenge unto themselves a preëminence herein, as though the Spirit of God was only in their hearts, and the word of God only to be fetched at their mouths, and the ordinance of God only to be had from their hands, except they were apostles? . . . This is contrary to the liberty of the gospel, which is free for all men at all times and in all places." They likewise took strong exception to the position "that elders must ordain elders." "If this be a perpetual rule," they ask the Mennonites, "then from whom is your eldership come? And if one church might once ordain, then why not all churches always?"

From the exclusion of Smyth and his adherents onward, Helwys and Murton were the leaders of what afterward came to be known as the General Baptists. Smyth continued till his death to antagonize pedobaptism, and few have ever presented the Baptist argument in a more convincing manner. Smyth claimed that the English sepa-

ratists had placed themselves in a position that they could not consistently hold. They had renounced the Church of England as apostate, and yet had been content with the baptism and the ordination that they had received in connection with that body; they claimed to be striving to set up churches of the regenerate, but continued to baptize infants, and without claiming that they were regenerated thereby, to give them a quasi-membership in their churches. Some of the opponents of Smyth, apparently under the influence of his arguments, abandoned the extreme separatist position in favor of what is known as semi-separatism.

Smyth and Helwys, and the followers of the latter, were equally clear in their apprehension and statement of the Baptist doctrine of liberty of conscience. In a long confession of faith prepared apparently by Smyth about 1611, Art. 84 reads: "That the magistrate is not by virtue of his office to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, to force or compel men to this or that form of religion or doctrine, but to leave Christian religion free to every man's conscience, and to handle only civil transgressions (Rom. xiii.), injuries, and wrongs of man against man, in murder, adultery, theft, etc., for Christ only is the king and lawgiver of the church and conscience (James iv. 12)." Helwys wrote: "The king is a mortal man and not God, therefore hath no power over the immortal souls of his subjects, to make laws and ordinances for them, and to set spiritual lords over them. If the king have authority to make spiritual lords and laws, then he is an immortal God and not a mortal man."

Helwys became convinced that fidelity to Christ required that he should proclaim the truth to his own countrymen in England, and that to remain in exile was cowardly.

Flight from persecution, he believed, "had been the overthrow of religion in this island; the best, ablest, and greater part being gone, and leaving behind them some few who, by the others' departure, have had their affliction and contempt increased, hath been the cause of many falling back, and of their adversaries' rejoicing." In 1611 or 1612 he returned to England with most or all of his followers, and the church took up its abode in London. It was this company of believers who set forth from 1614 onward those noble pleas for liberty of conscience that expounded the doctrine with a fullness and persuasiveness not greatly surpassed even by Roger Williams, and to which Williams himself seems to have been greatly indebted.¹

Helwys did not go so far as Smyth in the direction of Socinianism, but wrote vigorously in defense of the position "that God's decree is not the cause of any man's sin or condemnation, and that all men are redeemed by Christ; as also that no infants are condemned." He took a decided position, in opposition to the Mennonites, in favor of the true humanity of Christ and in favor of magistracy as an ordinance of God which "debarreth not any from being of the church of Christ." Helwys's tract against flight from persecution was elaborately answered by John Robinson, to whose citations we are indebted for our knowledge of this document. A number of his writings have been preserved, but are very rare.

Fortunately a considerable body of correspondence between the English Baptists and the Mennonites of Holland, dating from 1624 to 1626, has been preserved in the archives of the Mennonite church of Amsterdam, and has been made available. From this correspondence the fol-

¹ Tracts on liberty of conscience, in the Hanserd Knollys Society's collection.

lowing facts may be gathered or inferred: (1) That Helwys had passed away and that John Murton (or Morton) was now their chief leader. (2) That there were five congregations in close fellowship, viz., in London, Lincoln, Sarum, Coventry, and Tiverton. (3) That the London church had excommunicated one Elias Tookey, with a number of his followers, on account of their opinion about bearing with and tolerating the weak or those of little understanding in scriptural matters, who, however, were very conscientious in everything they knew, and peaceful and quiet in the church. From Tookey's own letter it would seem that some of the weak ones he desired to tolerate were deniers of the deity of Christ. It seems probable that Tookey's own views on this subject were Socinian rather than Trinitarian. This transaction would seem to show that the great majority of the English Baptists at this time laid considerable stress on right doctrinal views with respect to the person of Christ. (4) That both parties were eager to secure recognition by the Mennonites of Holland, and to enter into union with them. It is evident that now at last, after Helwys's death, the principles of Smyth had come to prevail. These Baptists were willing to yield much in order to secure the consent of the Mennonites to a union. The strength and dignity of the Mennonite churches, and the ability of their ministers, as well as the generosity of these earnest godly people toward the impoverished English exiles, had profoundly impressed the latter, and they felt the need of the moral support that the union would bring to their persecuted churches in England. (5) They differed from the Mennonites in a number of matters, but these differences, so far as they could not be explained away, they besought their Dutch friends to tolerate, at least for a time. The chief differences seem to have been with reference to oaths, magis-

tracy, warfare, and the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper. The Mennonites celebrated the Supper once or twice a year and were opposed to the weekly celebration; the English found great comfort in the weekly celebration and pleaded earnestly to be tolerated in this practice. The English did not see their way to reject oaths, magistracy, and warfare entirely, and asked for toleration of slight differences of opinion in these matters also. The Mennonites limited the administration of the ordinances to such as had received ordination; the English sought to explain their practice as substantially in accord with that of the Mennonites, but they would extend the privilege of administering the ordinances, in the absence of an ordained minister, to teachers and evangelists recognized as such by the church. The efforts at union would seem to have been unsuccessful. The Mennonites were too inflexible in their positions to make compromises.

After 1626 the General Baptists made rapid progress. By 1644 they are said to have had forty-seven churches, and by 1660 their membership had reached about 20,000. During the eighteenth century they shared in the general decline of religious life, and their Arminian principles made them peculiarly susceptible to the deadening influence of Socinianism. Most of their churches became openly Unitarian. As a result of the great revival under the leadership of the Wesleys and Whitefield the New Connection of General Baptists was formed in 1760 on an evangelical basis. As thus reorganized they still constitute a respectable party in England, and are now closely associated with the Particular Baptists.

VI. THE ENGLISH PARTICULAR BAPTISTS.¹

The appellative "Particular" as applied to Baptists has reference to their doctrine of redemption as limited to the elect, in contradistinction to the doctrine of universal redemption from which the General Baptists derived their designation. The rise of the Particular Baptists was as follows: in 1616 Henry Jacob, an Oxford graduate, who had been converted to Congregational views by Francis Johnson, and who had been for some years pastor of an English congregation at Middelburg, Zeeland, returned to England with a number of his church-members, and settled at Southwark, London. He doubtless soon gathered into his congregation the scattered members of earlier churches, so far as these had survived and remained in the vicinity. Jacob's church was to be the mother of the English Independents and of the Particular Baptists as well. Discouraged by the threatening aspect of ecclesiastical affairs, Jacob emigrated to Virginia in 1624. He was succeeded in the pastorate by John Lathrop, a Cambridge graduate. Pastor and people suffered almost constant persecution under Archbishop Laud. In 1632 forty of the members, including the pastor, were thrown into prison. Lathrop was released in 1634, but felt obliged to emigrate to New England. During Lathrop's pastorate a number withdrew "because the congregation kept not to their first principles of separation," and because they were "convinced that baptism was not to be administered to infants, but only to such as professed faith in Christ."

According to an account attributed to William Kiffin, a prominent actor in a later secession and afterward one of

¹ See Evans, Gould, Crosby, Ivimey, Masson, and the Hanserd Knollys Society's publications.

the most influential of the Particular Baptist leaders, "the church, considering that they were now grown very numerous, and so more than could, in these times of persecution, conveniently meet together, and believing also that those persons acted from a principle of conscience and not obstinacy, agreed to allow them the liberty they desired, and that they should be constituted a distinct church, which they performed the 12th of September, 1633. And as they believed that baptism was not rightly administered to infants, so they looked upon the baptism they had received in that age as invalid; whereupon most or all of them received a new baptism. Their minister was Mr. John Spilsbury."

According to a record of the original church, in 1638 seven others, whose names are given, "desiring to depart and not to be censured, our interest in them was remitted, with prayer made in their behalf, . . . they having first forsaken us and joined with Mr. Spilsbury."

Spilsbury felt no difficulty about the new introduction of believers' baptism, maintaining that "baptizedness is not essential to the administrator," and repudiating the demand for apostolic succession as leading logically to "the popedom of Rome."

The Baptist leaven would continue to work in this congregation until the whole mass should have been leavened. According to the "Kiffin Manuscript," "1640, 3d month. The church became two by mutual consent, just half being with Mr. P. Barebone, and the other half with Mr. H. Jessey. Mr. Richard Blunt with him, being convinced of baptism, that also it ought to be by dipping the body into the water, resembling burial and rising again (Col. ii. 12; Rom. vi. 4), had sober conference about it in the church; and then with some of the forenamed, who also were so convinced, and after prayer and conference about their so

enjoying it, none having then so practiced in England to professed believers, and hearing that some in the Netherlands had so practiced, they agreed and sent over Mr. Richard Blunt (who understood Dutch) with letters of commendation, who was kindly accepted there, and returned with letters from them, John Batte, a teacher there and from that church, to such as sent him. 1641. They proceed on therein—viz., those persons that were persuaded baptism should be by dipping the body had met in two companies and did intend so to meet after this; all these agreed to proceed alike together, and then manifesting (not by any formal words) a covenant (which word was scrupled by some of them), but by mutual desires and agreement each testified, these two companies did set apart one to baptize the rest, so it was solemnly performed by them. Mr. Blunt baptized Mr. Blacklock, that was a teacher amongst them, and Mr. Blunt being baptized, he and Mr. Blacklock baptized the rest of their friends that were so minded, and many being added to them, they increased much."

Among those who seceded with Spilsbury in 1633, and who were immersed in 1641, was Mark Lukar, who was afterward to occupy the position of ruling elder and to be a leading worker in John Clarke's church at Newport, R. I., of which he was "one of the first founders" (Felt), and who died at Newport at an advanced age in 1676, "leaving the character of a very worthy walker." This point of connection between the earliest Particular Baptist church of England and one of the two earliest American Baptist churches has hitherto, so far as the writer is aware, been overlooked, and is of considerable importance.

William Kiffin was not of the number baptized on the occasion referred to, but seems to have become a leader among the immersionists during 1642; for in October of

this year he took part in a disputation with Dr. Featley at Southwark. Kiffin, besides ministering to a congregation and taking a leading part in denominational matters, was greatly prospered in trade and became possessed of ample means, which he used with liberality for the advancement of the Baptist cause.

In 1643 further trouble arose in Jessey's church on the matter of infant baptism. Hanserd Knollys had returned from New England and had become a member of this church. Kiffin's account of the matter is as follows: "Hanserd Knollys, our brother, not being satisfied for baptizing his child, after it had been endeavored by the elder and by one or two more, himself referred to the church then, that they might satisfy him or he rectify them if amiss herein: which was well accepted. Hence meetings were appointed for conference about it." Kiffin was engaged in these conferences, which lasted from January 11 till March 17, 1644 (N. S.), "the issue whereof was the conviction of sixteen members against pedobaptism." These withdrew, Jessey and his friends agreeing: "(1) Not to excommunicate, no, nor admonish, which is only to obstinate. (2) To count them still of our church and pray [for] and love them. (3) Desire conversing together so far as their principles permit them."

There is something delightful about the good-will with which these successive divisions occurred. A parallel case would be difficult to find.

Kiffin seems to have organized a new church some time during the year 1644. By October of this year there were seven Particular Baptist churches, on whose behalf Kiffin, Patience, Spilsbury, and others signed a "Confession of Faith, of those churches which are commonly (though falsely) called Anabaptists." The aim of the confession was purely apologetical. Baptists had been

accused in a number of polemical writings of holding to the most monstrous errors, and of being capable, under favorable circumstances, of perpetrating the atrocities of Münster. The document is a clear setting forth of Calvinistic doctrine, along with a statement of baptist views on the ordinances. To guard against even the semblance of sacerdotalism it is stated that "the person designed by Christ to dispense baptism the Scripture holds forth to be a disciple; it being nowhere tied to a particular church-officer or person extraordinarily sent, the commission enjoining the administration being given to them as considered disciples, being men able to preach the gospel." The confession is in almost every detail in thorough accord with the views of modern American Baptists.

In 1645 Henry Jessey himself, pastor of the original Congregational church from which the materials for seven Baptist churches had gone forth, was baptized by Hanserd Knollys. Part of the remaining membership followed his example, while a part still adhered to infant baptism but retained their membership in the mixed church.

By 1646, when a second edition of the confession was issued, a French Particular Baptist church had been added.

A few remarks seem called for by the obscurity of some of the statements quoted above. It is not possible out of the material that has thus far come to light to trace in detail the evolution of the seven churches that signed the confession of 1644. The statement quoted from the so-called "Kiffin Manuscript" with reference to the division of 1640 involves a number of difficulties. P. Barebone, with whom half of the church withdrew, has commonly been regarded by Baptist writers as a Baptist. Yet in 1642 he published "A Discourse tending to prove the Baptism in, or under, the Defection of Antichrist to be the Ordinance of Jesus Christ, as also that the Baptism of

Infants or Children is Warrantable, and Agreeable to the Word of God," and in 1643 and 1644 he published other polemical tracts against antipedobaptism. If in 1641 he was the leader of the antipedobaptist and immersionist half of the dividing congregation he must soon after have abandoned his position. This is, of course, possible. From the construction of the sentence Jessey might be taken to be the leader of the Baptist half; but it appears that Jessey did not become a Baptist till five years later. This difficulty seems inexplicable without further materials.

The party in Holland from whom Blunt received baptism were the Rhynsburgers or Collegiants, a party derived probably from the Socinian antipedobaptists (1619), and, like them, practicing immersion. They had much in common with the Plymouth Brethren of the present century, laying great stress on freedom of prophesying, having no regular ministry, and baptizing freely, without doctrinal examination, those who professed faith in Christ. It seems not a little strange that these English Calvinistic Baptists should have thought their position improved by receiving baptism from such a source.

It was an almost inevitable consequence of the circumstances under which these churches were formed that open communion should have been to some extent practiced. The separations were from the beginning peaceful, and when the pastor of the original congregation became a Baptist, pedobaptist members remained in the church. Mixed churches involved open communion. William Kiffin became a staunch advocate of restricted communion; Henry Jessey, John Tombes, John Bunyan, and others advocated and practiced open communion. Restricted communion gained ground during the eighteenth century; but toward the close of that century and during the present century, under the influence of Robert

Robinson, Robert Hall, and Charles H. Spurgeon, open communion has become very general among English, but not among Welsh and Scotch, Baptists. Yet the number of close-communion churches in England is still considerable.

From 1645 until the Revolution (1688) the Particular Baptists rapidly increased in numbers and influence. In the Parliamentary army a large proportion of officers and soldiers were Baptists. Through the army Baptist churches were founded in Ireland and Scotland. Through the efforts of men like John Myles and Vavasour Powell, Baptist principles were planted in Wales, which proved highly fruitful soil. Baptists are said to have been chiefly instrumental in preventing Cromwell from assuming the dignity and prerogatives of royalty. They became greatly dissatisfied with Cromwell's military government, and many of them were prepared to aid in the restoration of Charles II., who was lavish in his promises of toleration. John Milton was an antipedobaptist and an advocate of believers' baptism, but there is no evidence of his having connected himself with a Baptist church. A number of prominent Baptists (including Jessey, Tombes, Dyke, and Myles) joined heartily in Cromwell's state-church scheme, acting as members of his Board of Tryers to pass upon the qualifications of candidates for the ministry, and accepting pastorates of state-endowed churches.

Under Charles II. Baptists suffered severe persecution, along with other dissenting parties. The imprisonment of John Bunyan, which is familiar, is a sample of what Baptists had to endure from the execution of the Act of Uniformity, the Conventicle Act, the Five-mile Act, and the Corporation and Test Acts.

With the Act of Toleration, under William and Mary (1689), a period of religious depression set in. At this

time the Particular Baptists numbered many thousands. More than a hundred churches united in adopting a Baptist recension of the Westminster Confession, which has proved the most important and influential confession ever put forth by Baptists. In a slightly modified form it has been widely accepted by American Baptists as "the Philadelphia Confession."

During the eighteenth century the Particular Baptists made little progress. In opposition to the current Socinianism a hard and barren hyper-Calvinism was developed, in accordance with which evangelistic effort is an impertinence. Through the influence of the evangelical revival of the middle of the eighteenth century the Calvinism of John Gill and John Brine gradually gave way to the more benignant teaching of Andrew Fuller and Robert Hall, and the great missionary movement inaugurated by William Carey became a possibility. From this time onward English Baptists have had a highly honorable history, though their American brethren are convinced that their progress has been hindered by the prevalence of open communion.

Particular and General Baptists have gradually approached each other until the union of the two bodies has been virtually consummated, and the distinctive names will doubtless soon be dropped. The Baptists of all parties in Britain number (1893) 342,507, of whom a large majority are of the Particular Baptist stock.

The relations of English Baptists to those of America have naturally been most intimate. Nearly all of the early American churches had among their constituent members those who had belonged to English Baptist churches, and nearly all received accessions from the mother-country from time to time. Through their generous beneficence, and their literature also, the English Baptists have profoundly influenced those of the New World. It need

hardly be said that in later times the influence through literature and otherwise has been reciprocal. During the American Revolution English Baptists as a body sympathized deeply with their American brethren in their struggle for civil and religious liberty, regarding their own liberty in England as involved in the issue.¹

¹ See letter of Dr. Rippon to President Manning in "Baptist Memorial," vol. iv., p. 133.

PERIOD I.

FROM THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST BAPTIST
CHURCH IN AMERICA TO THE GREAT
AWAKENING (1639-1740).

THE BAPTISTS.

CHAPTER I.

ROGER WILLIAMS AND LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.¹

TO Roger Williams belongs the distinction of being the first in America to introduce believers' baptism and to organize a church on Baptist principles. He was probably born in London about 1600.² Under the patronage of Sir Edward Coke, the famous jurist, he was educated at Sutton's Hospital and at the University of Cambridge, proceeding Bachelor of Arts in 1627. Whether during or shortly after the completion of his university course, he was led to adopt rigorous separatist principles. The England of 1630 was no place for nonconformists. In December of that year he set sail for New England, hoping there to be permitted to enjoy a measure of soul liberty denied him at home, and not without expectation of being able to exert some wholesome influence on the development of the

¹ On this and the following chapter see "Pub. Nar. Cl.;" "Rec. of the Col. of R. I.," i.; Arnold, i.; Caldwell in "Bapt. Qu.," 1872, pp. 385 *seq.*, "Hist. Disc.," and "His. First Bap. Ch. in Prov.;" Dexter, "As to R. W.;" Winthrop; Backus, "Hist.;" Knowles; Gammell; Straus; Barrows in "Bap. Qu.," 1876, pp. 353 *seq.*; Hubbard; Hutchinson; Lechford; Mather; and Comer.

² "New Eng. Gen. Register," 1889, pp. 291 *seq.* Straus favors 1607 as the year of his birth.

New World. "Truly it was as bitter as death to me," he wrote some years later to the daughter of Sir Edward Coke, "when Bishop Laud pursued me out of this land, and my conscience was persuaded against the national church and ceremonies and bishops, beyond the conscience of your dear father. I say it was as bitter as death to me, when I rode Windsor way to take ship at Bristol, and saw Stoke House, where the blessed man was, and I then durst not acquaint him with my conscience and my flight."

There can be no doubt but that he made considerable sacrifice, not in sentiment alone, but in position and prospects as well, in thus loyally following the dictates of conscience. "God knows," he wrote forty years afterward, "what gains and preferments I have refused in universities, city, country, and court in Old England, and something in New England, to keep my soul undefiled in this point, and not to act with a doubting conscience." He was not only an accomplished scholar (he was familiar with the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Dutch, and French languages), but he had a dignity of bearing, an eloquence and persuasiveness of tongue and pen, and a force of character, that, apart from his influential connections, would have commanded for him the highest positions at home or abroad.

Landing in New England in February, 1631, an attractive opening almost immediately presented itself. The pastor of the Boston church was returning to England and Williams was invited to supply his place. Did he accept the invitation? Far from it. The Boston church was "an unseparated church," and he "durst not officiate to" it. He was prompted to give utterance, while in Boston, to a conviction, formed no doubt long before—familiar and commonplace now, startling and revolutionary then and there—that the magistrate may not punish any sort of "breach of the first table," such as idolatry, Sabbath-breaking, false

worship, blasphemy, etc.; and he had thus succeeded in convincing the leading men of the colony that he was an impracticable and dangerous man—all the more dangerous because of his splendid gifts and his unswerving loyalty to conscience. It was only what might have been expected, when the Salem church a few months later invited him to be their teacher, that six of the leading men of Boston should have sent a joint letter of warning to Governor Endicott of Salem. Thus prevented from settling at Salem, he betook himself to the older and more thoroughly separatist Plymouth colony, where he was cordially received, and soon became associated as teacher with Ralph Smith, pastor of the church. Here he remained about two years. According to Governor Bradford, "his teaching was well approved, for the benefit whereof I still bless God, and am thankful to him even for his sharpest admonitions and reproofs, so far as they agreed with truth." According to Brewster, elder of the church, toward the close of the period Williams began to "vent" "divers of his own singular opinions," and to "seek to impose them upon others." "Not finding such concurrence as he expected, he desired his dismissal to the church of Salem," which, with considerable reluctance on the part of some, was granted. It is certain that the influential people of Boston were industriously fostering any spirit of dissatisfaction that may have arisen. During his stay at Plymouth he spent much time with the Indians, and succeeded in so far mastering their language as to be able to converse freely with them and afterward to write "The Key into the Language of America," which he hoped might prove an important aid in the evangelization of the natives of the entire continent. His friendship with the Indians was afterward of incalculable advantage not only to himself but to his fellow-colonists. "My soul's desire," he wrote

some time afterward, "was to do the natives good. God was pleased to give me a painful, patient spirit to lodge with them in their filthy, smoky holes, even when I lived at Plymouth and Salem, to gain their tongue." So great was his influence over them that if he had been bent on making mere nominal Christians of them, he could, he thought, have baptized whole tribes.

In August, 1634, he was invited to succeed Skelton in the pastorate of the Salem church, having since his arrival served as assistant pastor. The Boston authorities remonstrated, and a struggle ensued that resulted in Williams's banishment in the midst of winter, January, 1636. Befriended by the Indians, after much hardship he reached Narragansett Bay, where he secured land from the Indians and established a colony on the principle of absolute liberty of conscience.

The controversy of Roger Williams with the Massachusetts authorities that led to his banishment, and the literary controversy that was carried on between Williams and Cotton some years after the former had established a colony of his own, are matters of such importance in themselves, and have been the occasion of so much partisan writing on the part of Baptists and the defenders of the standing order alike, that a clear statement of the facts seems here desirable. It need scarcely be said that the idea of liberty of conscience, though it had been advocated, as we have seen, by the antipedobaptists of the sixteenth century, and though it had been set forth with the utmost distinctness and emphasis by the General Baptists of England during the twenty years just preceding Williams's controversy with the New England authorities, had not dawned upon the minds of the men of Massachusetts Bay. If anybody felt impelled to teach or practice anything at variance with the teachings and practices of the standing

order, the world was wide and there was room enough outside of the jurisdiction of the company ; inside he could not remain. The year after Williams's arrival (1632) it was enacted that, "to the end that the body of the commons may be preserved of honest and good men, . . . for the time to come no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same." Exclusion from a church meant loss of citizenship, and the General Court was ready to execute ecclesiastical censures. We can scarcely conceive of a more perfect equipment for the exercise of tyranny and the violation of conscience than existed in this small community thus theocratically organized. That this theocratic legislation was not a dead letter on the statute-book we shall soon see.

It must be admitted, on the other hand, that men of convictions and conscience are not always the most agreeable members of society. The man who concentrates his attention upon one or two matters that seem to the great body of his contemporaries of minor moment, and advocates his peculiar views in such a way as to cause division and to bring the community into bad repute, can scarcely expect to be cordially treated in any age or in any land. The man who is travelling in spirit with a great revolutionary idea is likely to do far less than justice to other ideas and to existing institutions, and to act without regard to immediate consequences. Roger Williams was a man of profound convictions on a particular class of subjects. To us the importance of some of the matters upon which he fixed his attention is manifest ; but we are forced to admit that he was often extreme and inconsiderate in the pressing of his convictions. The vast importance of the absolute separation of church and state, of complete separation from an apostate church, and of absolute liberty

of conscience, had completely mastered his soul, and considerations of expediency were as dust in the balance in comparison. We can do him full honor for his consistent advocacy of these principles in season and out of season, without being unduly severe in our judgment of his opponents and persecutors.

Let us look more particularly at the points in which he came in conflict with the standing order :

1. He was an ardent separatist, regarding the Church of England as utterly apostate, and considering it a sin to have any sort of communion with it—a sin so grievous as to place those guilty of it, or who had fellowship with those guilty of it, outside the pale of his fellowship. This view he remorselessly pressed, from the date of his arrival till that of his expulsion, at great self-sacrifice and to the unspeakable discomfort of those who did not see eye to eye with him in this matter.

2. He was radically and unalterably opposed to the charter of the company, and regarded the colony as committing an enormous sin in living under it. He insisted on having it returned to King Charles without delay as an accursed thing. In his opinion it contained “matter of falsehood and injustice—falsehood in making the king the first Christian prince who had discovered these parts, and injustice in giving the country to his English subjects which belonged to the native Indians.” According to his own account of the matter, written some years later, he and others—“not a few”—were convinced of “the sin of the patents, wherein Christian kings (so called) are invested with right, by virtue of their Christianity, to take and give away the lands of other men ; as also the unchristian oaths swallowed down at their coming forth from Old England, especially in the superstitious Laud’s time and domineering. And I know these thoughts so deeply afflicted the

soul of the discussor, in the time of his walking in the way of New England's worship, that he at last came to a persuasion that such sins could not be expiated without returning again into England, or a public acknowledgment and confession of so-and-so departing. To this purpose, before his troubles and banishment, he drew up a letter (not without the approbation of some of the chief of New England, then tender also upon this point before God) directed unto the king himself, humbly acknowledging the evil of that part of the patent which respects the donation of land, etc. This letter and other endeavors (tending to wash off public sins and, above all, to pacify and give glory unto God) it may be that counsels from flesh and blood suppressed." From Governor Winthrop's account it appears that Williams charged King James with blasphemy for calling Europe Christendom, and applied to King Charles some of the most opprobrious epithets in the Apocalypse. To this, among other causes, Williams attributed his banishment. When we reflect upon the extreme danger in which the colony stood from unfriendly interference on the part of the home government, it is easy to realize the consternation into which the utterance of such sentiments, and especially the proposal to write the king in person, setting forth the iniquity of the patent, must have thrown the responsible leaders of the colony. The ordinary arguments by which the appropriation of lands occupied by savage peoples was defended and is still defended were used in vain on Roger Williams. The representation of the fearful peril to which he was exposing the colony made no impression whatever upon him. Conscience was uttering its voice, and it should not, in him at least, go unheeded.

3. Equally strong and unalterable were his convictions against the administration of oaths to the unregenerate,

and the inviting of such to join in prayer or in any act of worship. To protect itself against disloyal persons who were likely to cause disharmony in the colony and to send slanderous and injurious reports to England, it was decided soon after Williams's arrival to administer an oath of fidelity to the people indiscriminately. Most vehemently did Williams oppose the oath, "partly," according to John Cotton, "because it was Christ's prerogative to have his office established by oath; partly because an oath was a part of God's worship, and God's worship was not to be put upon carnal persons, as he conceived many of the people to be." "So by his tenet," Cotton proceeds, "neither might church-members nor other godly men take the oath, because it was the establishment, not of Christ, but of mortal men in their office; nor might men out of the church take it, because in his eye they were but carnal." Such sturdy opposition to a favorite measure did not tend to gain for Williams the favor of the court, especially as that self-respecting body felt itself obliged thereby "to desist from that proceeding."

4. But the immediate and probably the most influential causes of Williams's banishment were his defiant attitude toward the court and the leading churches of the colony in accepting the pastorate of the Salem church against their earnest and oft-repeated protest, and the proceedings of the Salem church and colony under his direction with reference to a certain piece of land. Salem colonists petitioned the Massachusetts Bay Court for a tract of land near Marblehead to which they considered themselves entitled. What more natural than that the court should make its favorable action conditional on the church's making amends for its insolent conduct in installing Williams as pastor against the remonstrance of court and ministers? Do we wonder that Williams and his church were thoroughly in-

dignant at this undisguised attempt to influence church action by a bribe? Wisely or unwisely, they framed a red-hot denunciation of the procedure, and sent it to the other churches, calling their attention to the grievous sin committed by their members, the magistrates. The aim of the Salem church would seem to have been to induce the churches to compel the magistrates, by disciplinary means, to deal righteously or else to vacate their offices. Williams has been charged with inconsistency in being a party to such an admonition; but it is not clear why the Salem church was not justified in appealing to sister-churches to discipline members that had committed grievous wrong. It was not against magistrates as such, but against offending church-members, that the complaint was uttered. But however justifiable the procedure may have been, it was certainly in the highest degree impolitic. The churches and magistrates were irritated thereby beyond measure, and proceeded to labor so vigorously with the offending church as to induce a majority to abandon their heroic pastor and to consent to his removal. Williams on his part was led to denounce in scathing language the Massachusetts churches, and to renounce communion with them. Further, he would have no fellowship with the Salem church unless it would join him in denouncing and disfellowshipping the other churches. A majority of the members refusing so to do, he never entered the church again, but held services in his own house with such as were faithful to his principles.

The decision to banish Williams was not hastily reached. Indeed, if we bear in mind the court's freedom from conscientious scruples as to the employment of force in matters of religion, and the pertinacity with which Williams advocated views regarded as unsettling and dangerous, we can scarcely fail to admire the forbearance of this body.

The processes that resulted in his banishment extended over more than a year. In December, 1634, Williams was summoned to appear before the next session of the court, to be held in the following March. The charges preferred were those of preaching against the charter, and his "usual terming of the Church of England antichristian." John Cotton, the Boston minister, persuaded the court "to forbear civil prosecution" until the ministers should have "dealt with him in a church way to convince him of sin." Meanwhile arose the difficulty as to the free-man's oath already referred to. He was arraigned before the court and, in the opinion of his opponents, though by no means in his own, "confuted" by the ministers. But the court was not prepared even yet to adopt extreme measures. At about this time (May, 1635) the Salem church, in defiance of the court and the ministers, proceeded to make Williams full pastor. Williams was no doubt encouraged by this show of confidence to continue his sharp denunciations of charter and oaths. In July he was again summoned to court, and charged with advocating opinions dangerous to the common welfare. Besides the matters already mentioned, he is charged with maintaining "that a man ought not to pray with the unregenerate," and "that a man ought not to give thanks after the sacrament nor after meat." The controversy about the Marblehead land followed. A decree of banishment was issued October 19, 1635, to take effect within six weeks. A severe illness, contracted while attending court, prevented the carrying out of the decree within the appointed time, and Williams was permitted to remain until spring, provided he would abstain from teaching his peculiar views. It transpired, however, that his sympathizers were in the habit of gathering at his house, and that he was disregarding the restriction. Arrangements were made to

seize him and transport him to England, where he might experience the tender mercies of Laud. Forewarned, he took refuge in the wilderness. He made his way to his Indian friends, who shared with him such comforts as they had. "I was sorely tossed for one fourteen weeks," he wrote some time afterward, "not knowing what bread or bed did mean." He complains bitterly in another writing of having been "exposed to winter miseries in a howling wilderness." He firmly believed that if he had perished in his wilderness wanderings his blood would have been on the heads of his persecutors.

"If we were forced to adopt a modern designation for him," writes Professor Masson, referring to Roger Williams, "we should call him the father of all that has figured anywhere, in Great Britain or in the United States or in the British colonies, under the name of voluntaryism." Elsewhere he designates him as an "arch-individualist." If by "father" is to be understood "originator," the expression is far too strong; for, as we have seen, the General Baptists of England were a score of years in advance of him in their advocacy of these very principles, and Williams's direct indebtedness to their pleas for liberty of conscience is indisputable. But if the expression be taken to mean that by his persistent and zealous advocacy of these views, and by his successful embodying of them in a civil constitution, he first brought them prominently before the English-speaking public, and was instrumental in securing their wide acceptance, we do not demur. Yet even in this matter we should not forget that the honor must be divided with John Clarke.

Roger Williams advocated the most complete separation of church and state at a time when there was no historical example of such separation; nay, when to the mass of Christian men everywhere such a separation was almost

inconceivable. The following extracts set forth succinctly his view of the relations of church and state:

"The civil magistrate either respecteth that religion and worship which his conscience is persuaded is true, and upon which he ventures his soul, or else that and those which he is persuaded are false. Concerning the first, if that which the magistrate believeth to be true be true, I say he owes a threefold duty unto it: First, approbation and countenance, a reverent esteem and honorable testimony, . . . with a tender respect for truth and the professors of it. Secondly, personal submission of his own soul to the power of the Lord Jesus in the spiritual government and kingdom. Thirdly, protection of such true professors of Christ, whether apart or met together, as also of their estates, from violence and injury. . . . If it be a false religion (unto which the civil magistrate doth not dare adjoin, yet) he owes: First, permission (for approbation he owes not to that which is evil). . . . Secondly, he owes protection to the persons of his subjects (though of a false worship), that no injury be offered either to the persons or goods of any."

Here we have the gist of his contention expressed in his own words. How ably and how voluminously he defended the principles involved, by means of Scripture, history, and reason, any one can see who will take the trouble to read "*The Bloody Tenent of Persecution*," "*The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody*," and other minor treatises of his bearing on this subject.

Some time after Williams's banishment the learned and pious John Cotton felt it his duty to make one more effort to convert him from the error of his ways. In a long letter, afterward published, he attempted to justify the New England state-church arrangement, and the employment of the civil magistracy for the execution of ecclesias-

tical censures. He refused to admit that Williams had been hardly dealt with, and sought to throw the entire responsibility upon Williams himself. He even attributed the severe illness Williams suffered just after the decree of banishment to God's displeasure with his conduct, and suggested that he should consider banishment from a country with whose inhabitants he could have no religious fellowship a blessing rather than a hardship. Williams's somewhat caustic answer to this letter was published soon afterward. Cotton published an elaborate rejoinder, in which he ransacked the Scriptures for materials to be used in justifying the union of church and state and the punishment of religious delinquencies by the civil magistracy. His principal reliance was, of course, on the Old Testament; but by unnatural and forced interpretations he sought to bring a number of New Testament passages to the support of his position. He appealed, moreover, to history, and endeavored to show therefrom the utter impracticability of *laissez faire* in religion. He sought, also, to vindicate his own consistency in separating from the Church of England and in denouncing the Laudian *régime*, and yet in New England refusing toleration to those who differed from him. This called forth Williams's famous "Bloody Tenent of Persecution," already mentioned. Cotton replied in "The Bloody Tenent of Persecution Washed in the Blood of the Lamb." Williams rejoined in the most voluminous of all his works, "The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody, by Mr. Cotton's Endeavor to Wash it White in the Blood of the Lamb, of whose Precious Blood, spilt in the Blood of His Servants, and of the Blood of Millions spilt in former and later Wars for Conscience' sake, that most Bloody Tenent of Persecution for cause of Conscience, upon a second Trial, is found now more apparently and more notoriously guilty."

It will be impracticable for us to follow Roger Williams in the intricacies of his argument through his thousand pages. A few quotations bearing upon one or other aspect of the great question of religious liberty must suffice. He speaks of "that body-killing, soul-killing, and state-killing doctrine of not permitting but persecuting all other consciences and ways of worship but his own in the civil state, and so, consequently, in the whole world, if the power or empire were in his [Cotton's] hand." Again: "Soul yokes, soul oppression, plunderings, ravishings, etc., are of a crimson and deepest dye, and I believe the chief of England's sins, unstopping the vials of England's present sorrows." "Only two things," he writes, "I shall humbly suggest . . . as the greatest causes, fountains, and tap-roots of all the indignation of the Most High against the state and country: First, that the whole nations and generations of men have been forced (though unregenerate and unrepentant) to pretend and assume the name of Christ Jesus, which only belongs, according to the institution of the Lord Jesus, to truly regenerate and repenting souls. Secondly, that all others dissenting from them, whether Jews or Gentiles, their countrymen especially (for strangers have a liberty), have not been permitted civil cohabitation in this world with them, but have been distressed and persecuted by them." Again: "The greatest yokes yet lying on English necks are of a spiritual and soul nature." "This tenet of the magistrates' keeping the church from apostatizing, by practicing civil force upon the consciences of men, is so far from preserving religion pure that it is a mighty bulwark or barricade to keep out all true religion; yea, and all godly magistrates for [from?] ever coming into the world." Here is a fine bit of sarcasm: "Are the armories of the true King Solomon, Christ

Jesus, disarmed? Are there no spiritual swords girt upon the thighs of those valiant ones that should guard his heavenly bed, except the sword of steel to be run for from the cutler's shop? Is the religion of Jesus Christ so poor and so weak and so feeble grown, so cowardly and base, that neither the soldiers nor commanders in Christ's army have any courage or skill to withstand sufficiently in all points a false teacher, a false prophet, a spiritual cheater or deceiver?" "If the elders and churches and ordinances of Christ have such need of the civil sword for their maintenance and protection (I mean in spiritual things), sure the Lord Jesus cannot be excused for not being careful either to express this great ordinance in his will and testament, or else to have furnished the civil state and officers thereof with ability and hearts for this their great duty and employment, to which he hath called them."

As a founder of a State no less than as an advocate of a great principle Roger Williams deserves the gratitude and respect of all lovers of religious and civil liberty; and it is the glory of the Baptists that the first State ever founded on the principle of absolute liberty of conscience was founded by a man who then and throughout his subsequent life was one of the staunchest advocates of fundamental Baptist principles, and who, shortly after he had effected an organization of the body politic, was the first to introduce believers' baptism and to organize a church of baptized believers. Professor Masson describes the civic part of Williams's life-work as "the organization of a community on the unheard-of principle of absolute religious liberty combined with perfect civil democracy." Having personally secured from the natives for a trifling consideration the land that was needed, he admitted to equal rights with himself twelve "loving friends and

neighbors," most of whom were, like himself, fugitives from Massachusetts for conscience' sake, "and such others as the major part of us shall admit into the same fellowship of vote with us." These promised to submit in active or passive obedience to all such orders or agreements as should "be made for public good of the body in an orderly way, by the major consent of the . . . inhabitants, . . . *only in civil things.*" In a later document Williams writes: "Having made covenant of peaceable neighborhood with all the sachems and natives round about us, and having, in a sense of God's merciful providence unto me in my distress, called the place Providence, I desired it might be for a shelter for persons distressed for conscience; I then, considering the condition of divers of my distressed countrymen, communicated my said purchase to my loving friends." This first organization took place in 1638. In securing the land from the Indians Williams had the valuable assistance of Sir Henry Vane, who also served him very efficiently a few years later in securing a charter.

In 1640 another agreement was signed by thirty-nine freemen. Among the articles was the following: "We agree, as formerly hath been the liberties of this town, so still to hold forth liberty of conscience."

In 1643 the Rhode Island and the Providence people requested Roger Williams to proceed to England for a charter. The Civil War was raging when he reached England, and the Presbyterian party was in power. Through the good offices of Sir Henry Vane he obtained a charter for "The Incorporation of Providence Plantations, in the Narragansett Bay, in New England." This charter gave full power to the inhabitants "to rule themselves, and such others as shall hereafter inhabit within any part of the said tract of land, by such form of civil government as by vol-

untary consent of all or the greater part of them they shall find most suitable to their estate and condition." Williams had been obliged to sail from New York in going for the charter; but in England he received such recognition as enabled him to return by way of Boston. In 1647 Providence and the three Rhode Island towns, Newport, Portsmouth, and Warwick, united under the charter, and a code of laws, democratic in spirit and providing for liberty of conscience, was adopted. A fuller account of these transactions will be given in a subsequent chapter.

Difficulties arose again about 1651, owing to the usurpation of William Coddington, supported by the Massachusetts authorities. Accompanied by John Clarke, pastor of the Newport Baptist church and one of the most influential men in the colony, Williams again proceeded to England in the interests of his fellow-citizens. Cromwell was now at the head of the government, and their mission proved entirely successful. After the restoration of the Stuarts it was thought best to secure a royal charter and thus to put the colony on a footing of complete equality with Massachusetts. It must be admitted that in becoming a party to the securing of a royal charter Roger Williams virtually receded from the radical position respecting charters for which he contended so pertinaciously when in Massachusetts, and which constituted one of the chief causes of his banishment. The staunchest admirers of Williams would hardly seek to justify his earlier position with respect to charters, oaths, rigorous separation from the unregenerate in prayer and other religious exercises, etc. He continued to attach chief importance to the titles to the lands of the colony that he had secured from the native chiefs, but he did not disdain to secure the further advantages which recognition by the English government would give. In fact such recognition proved to be neces-

sary for preserving the colony from anarchy and from subjugation by the stronger colonies.

Apologists for the New England theocracy have attempted to show that even in Roger Williams's colony the rights of conscience were not strictly guarded, and that penalties were inflicted for substantially the same classes of offenses as those for which Williams was banished. Among the cases adduced is that of Samuel Gorton, an antinomian and anarchist, and withal one of the most violent agitators and licentious defamers of the time. That Williams should have used his influence in favor of withholding from such a man the rights of citizenship is thought to be a virtual justification of his own banishment for agitating against the charter and the freeman's oath and for his revolutionary procedures at Salem. This occurred in 1640. Still earlier (1638), Verins, a "boisterous and desperate" young man, was disfranchised at Providence for maltreating his wife and refusing to allow her to attend church services, thus interfering with her liberty of conscience. Williams's severe polemics against the Quakers, and his denunciation of the book of one William Harris as teaching high treason, are also cited as instances of inconsistency with his Massachusetts record, and as completely destroying his right to complain of the treatment he received in Massachusetts. A careful examination of the cases cited will show, it is believed, that the distinction between civil and religious offenses was ever carefully guarded by Roger Williams. At the same time it must be admitted that, when the responsibility rested upon him of dealing practically with disturbers of the peace who sought to make their religious convictions a pretext for ignoring civil regulations thought to be essential to the well-being of the community, he felt the necessity of guarding against unwarranted and licentious applications

of the doctrine of liberty of conscience. It is only fair that side by side with his statement of this great principle we should place his own caveat against unwarranted applications thereof:

“That ever I should speak or write a tittle that tends to such an infinite liberty of conscience [as that it is blood-guiltiness, and contrary to the rule of the gospel, to execute judgment upon transgressors against the public or private weal] is a mistake, and which I have ever disclaimed and abhorred. To prevent such mistakes I at present shall only propose this case: There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common; and is a true picture of a commonwealth, or an human combination, or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked into one ship. Upon which supposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for turns upon these two hinges: that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship’s prayers or worship; nor compelled from their own particular prayers or worship, if they practice any. I further add that I never denied that notwithstanding this liberty the commander of this ship ought to command the ship’s course; yea, and also command that justice, peace, and sobriety be kept and practiced, both among the seamen and all the passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their service, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help in person or purse toward the common charges or defense; if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship, concerning their common peace or preservation; if any shall mutiny and rise up against their commanders and officers; if any should preach or write that there ought to be no commanders nor officers because all are equal in

Christ, therefore no masters nor officers, no laws nor orders, no corrections nor punishments—I say: I never denied but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel, and punish such transgressors, according to their deserts and merits.”

This statement as to the limitation of the application of the doctrine of liberty of conscience was made after many years of trying experience as governor and chief citizen in a new colony, which by reason of the liberal basis on which it was constituted became the resort of some of the most desperate agitators against all civil and religious order, the triumph of whose principles would have completely subverted the basis on which the community was founded. At the same time this view of the matter forbids that we should censure too severely the Massachusetts authorities for seeking to preserve the ecclesiastical and civil order to establish which they had left England, and which they supposed would be jeopardized by the toleration of such teachings as those of Williams before his banishment, or those of the Baptists and Quakers, which they thoroughly misunderstood, and which they honestly supposed to be fraught with the greatest dangers to the commonwealth. While we must accord all honor to Roger Williams for advocating liberty of conscience in all its length and breadth at a time when he was almost alone among men of his class and condition in grasping this fundamental gospel principle, we must beware of looking with contempt on men like Cotton and Mather and Hooker and Winthrop for following Luther and Melancthon and Calvin and Knox, of the Reformation time, and the great contemporary theologians of Europe, in regarding the doctrine of liberty of conscience as utterly impracticable and as sure to result in civil and religious anarchy.

CHAPTER II.

ROGER WILLIAMS AND THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH IN AMERICA.

IT remains to consider Roger Williams's relation to the Baptists. The great principle of absolute liberty of conscience, which Baptists had been almost alone in advocating since the early years of the Protestant Revolution, he adopted, wrought out in all its consequences, and embodied in the constitution of the colony which he founded. The principle of separatism from the corrupt state churches seemed to him logically to involve the Baptist position. He firmly believed that the prelatial Church of England was an apostate church, and that true believers should have no fellowship whatever with such a church. He repudiated with the utmost decision ordinances administered by an apostate church, as well as its worship and teachings. He insisted with vehemence on regenerate church-membership. His repudiation of Church of England ordinances involved, from his point of view, the repudiation of the baptism that he and others had received in this communion. His insistence on regenerate membership involved the rejection of infant baptism. Having become convinced that these consequences were involved in his position, he was too faithful to his convictions not to go where logic led. Accordingly, about March, 1639, two years after his banishment, he repudiated the baptism he had received in infancy, and was immersed by Ezekiel Holliman, who be-

fore he left Massachusetts had shown a strong inclination toward Baptist principles. Williams then proceeded to baptize Holliman and eleven others. Thus was founded the first Baptist church in the New World. It may be of interest to note that the organization of this first Baptist church in America was only about five years later than that of the first Particular Baptist church in England under the leadership of John Spilsbury, and that the introduction of immersion by Williams was three years in advance of its introduction among the Baptists of England.¹

Precisely what personal influence was brought to bear upon Roger Williams to lead him to take this step is uncertain. Winthrop attributes his antipedobaptist views to the influence of Mrs. Scott, a sister of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, the famous antinomian agitator. It can scarcely be doubted that he was already familiar with Baptist principles as held by English Baptists, and his familiarity with the Dutch language would make it unreasonable to suppose that he was wholly ignorant of the Mennonites and their principles.

It is, of course, a matter of regret to Baptists that Roger Williams was not able to rest in what he had done in the direction of restoring the ordinances whose valid administration had, in his opinion, been lost through apostasy. Like John Smyth, the founder of the English General Baptists, he soon began to doubt the warrantableness of thus introducing anew believers' baptism. He had no question whatever as to the proper subjects or the act of baptism. The only question that concerned him was that of the validity of administration. If the church had never apostatized believers' baptism would have been continued

¹ Contemporary testimony is unanimous in favor of the view that immersion was practiced by Williams. As this fact is generally conceded, it does not seem worth while to quote the evidence.

and would have been obligatory. But the ordinance having been lost, he doubted whether it could be restored apart from a special (miraculous) divine authorization. He seems to have hoped that such might hereafter be vouchsafed. Until then he could only occupy the position of a seeker.

His relations with the Baptists continued to be friendly, and several years afterward (1649), when a flourishing Baptist church existed at Newport under the leadership of John Clarke, and the Providence church was still carrying forward its work, he wrote to his friend John Winthrop, Jr.: "At Seekonk a great many have lately concurred with Mr. John Clarke and our Providence men about the point of a new baptism, and the manner by dipping; and Mr. John Clarke hath been there lately (and Mr. Lucar) and hath dipped them. I believe their practice comes nearer the first practice of our great Founder Christ Jesus than other practices of religion do, and yet I have not satisfaction neither in the authority by which it is done, nor in the manner; nor in the prophecies concerning the rising of Christ's kingdom after the desolations by Rome, etc." As regards the manner of the baptism, it is probable that he thought strict adherence to primitive practice required trine immersion, or the kneeling of the candidate and immersion by pressing the head forward. As regards the interpretation of prophecy, it appears that he was doubtful whether we have sufficient reason to expect a complete rehabilitation of the Christian church in the present dispensation. From his correspondence during this period it appears that he regarded it as probable that Rome would powerfully reassert herself in the immediate future, persecuting and destroying, and that afterward a new dispensation, perhaps accompanied by the second advent of the Messiah, would be ushered in.

From his vigorous, almost atrocious, polemics against the Quakers, it is evident that he had no sympathy whatever with their grounds for the disuse of the ordinances. Equally decided was his antagonism to the mystical (semi-panteistic) antinomianism of the time. In his old age (1676), in his writing against the Quakers, referring evidently to the Baptists, who by this time had greatly increased in numbers and influence both in England and in America, he remarks: "After all my search and examinations and considerations . . . I do profess to believe that some come nearer to the first primitive churches and the institutions and appointments of Christ Jesus than others; as in many respects, so in that gallant and heavenly and fundamental principle of the true matter of a Christian congregation, flock, or society—viz., actual believers, true disciples and converts, living stones, such as can give some account how the grace of God hath appeared unto them and wrought that heavenly change in them. If my soul could find rest in joining unto any of the churches professing Christ Jesus now extant, I would readily and gladly do it." This is substantially in accord with the following earlier declaration (1643): "The two first principles and foundations of true religion, or worship of the true God in Christ, are repentance from dead works and faith toward God, before the doctrines of baptism or washing and the laying on of hands, which continue the ordinances and practices of worship; the want of which I conceive is the bane of millions of souls in England, and all other nations professing to be Christian nations, who are brought by public authority to baptism and fellowship with God in ordinances of worship, before the saving work of repentance and a true turning to God." We may be sure that if he had seen his way to the founding of a denomination more apostolic than the Baptist, and with

ordinances administered more authoritatively, he would not have contented himself with the one experiment, but would have gone forward to embody in practice any new light attained; that he would have sought either to convince his Baptist brethren that something was lacking to the completeness of their apostolic standing, or to win others to his supposedly more apostolic and authoritative position. The fact is that he remained a Baptist in everything except in his demand for direct divine sanction for the restoration of the ordinances long since hopelessly lost. Had Roger Williams been acquainted with the results of the latest researches in medieval history he would probably not have been so absolutely sure that the ordinances had been lost, even on the supposition that apostolic succession is a condition of their valid continuance. But he was manifestly in error in making the validity of Christian ordinances to depend upon any ceremonial or personal qualification of the administrator—the error of the Donatists in the early centuries, and of high-churchmen, Episcopal and Baptist, in modern times. As in the case of many great and good men before and since Roger Williams's time, his church life was wrecked and his Christian usefulness greatly impaired by his efforts to interpret the prophetic and apocalyptic Scriptures with reference to the events and movements of his own time—a procedure fraught with danger, invariably resulting in error, and oftentimes ending in disaster.

The history of the First Baptist Church of Providence after the withdrawal of Roger Williams is for some years involved in considerable obscurity. The original records have been lost, and some have sought to make it appear that for a time it ceased entirely to exist, and that the surviving organization is independent of the first. The chief interest involved in this contention has been a desire

to give precedence to the First Baptist Church of Newport, founded in 1644 or earlier.

According to Governor Winthrop's account, Williams was led to introduce believers' baptism and to organize a church on this basis by Mrs. Scott, a sister of Mrs. Hutchinson and the wife of Richard Scott, who, after walking in the Baptist way for some time along with Williams, and probably after the withdrawal of the latter, cast in his lot with the Quakers. It is not possible to be sure of the names of the entire number of those baptized by Williams. In July, 1639, the Salem church, under Hugh Peters, passed the "great censure" on Roger Williams and his wife, John Throckmorton and his wife, Thomas Olney and his wife, Stukely Westcot and his wife, Mary Holliman, and Widow Reeves. "These wholly refused to hear the church, denying it and all the churches of the Bay to be true churches, and (except two) are all rebaptized." (Felt, i., 379, 380.) Throckmorton, Westcot, and Olney were among those whom Williams admitted to an equal footing with himself in relation to the lands he had secured from his Indian friends, and who joined with him in organizing the community. Which of the Salem excommunicates were not "rebaptized" we are not in a position to determine. Besides Throckmorton, Olney, Westcot, Holliman, and their wives, and Williams's wife, there must have been two other constituent members. These may have been Richard Scott and his wife, mentioned above. Scott was not of the original company, but appears among those who were admitted by the vote of the company on the payment of thirty shillings each, along with Chad Brown and William Wicken-den, who were later to become the pastors of the Baptist church. These last, along with a considerable number of others admitted shortly after the organization of the community, seem to have been new arrivals from England,

as their names do not appear on the roll of Massachusetts freemen. It is highly probable that several of these, as well as some of the later arrivals, had been members of Baptist churches in England, and that some or most of this latter class were General (Arminian) Baptists. The early intrusion of Arminian elements was probably one cause of the discord that came perilously near wrecking this first Baptist church in America.

It is probable that after Williams's withdrawal Thomas Olney, one of the constituent members of the church, succeeded to the leadership. The body had no regular meeting-place, but assembled out of doors in favorable weather and in private houses at other times. It is not likely that the work of evangelization was carried forward with much vigor, or that the leadership of the church was energetic. William Wickenden, Gregory Dexter, and Chad Brown seem to have united with the church soon after its organization, and to have held to Arminian views. Along with Arminianism they laid much stress on the ceremonial imposition of hands after baptism as an indispensable qualification for church-fellowship. During the early history of the Providence church it appears that plurality of eldership prevailed. It is probable that Olney, Brown, Wickenden, and Dexter were coördinate elders at the time of the schism in 1652. Following the lead of the early English Baptist churches, this church laid little stress on ordination to the ministry as a qualification for the administration of the ordinances, and gave the fullest scope to the exercise of "lay" gifts. It is doubtful whether any of these elders would have approved of the use of the title "Rev." in connection with their names. The complete informality of the organization and the services of this church, and the heterogeneity of the elements of which it was composed, as well as the influence of antinomians who

abounded in the community, would make a greater or less degree of discord a thing to be expected. It is probable that differences of opinion as to the extent of Christ's redemptive work were at the basis of the first agitations in the church. Roger Williams was a thoroughgoing Calvinist, and most of the original members of the church were probably at one with him in holding to particular redemption and related doctrines. Brown, Wickenden, and Dexter seem to have early declared themselves in favor of general redemption and related doctrines. Apart from the fact that Calvinism was the system of the persecuting Puritans of England and America, a Socinianized Arminianism represented by the English General Baptists was at this time making rapid headway in England and America, and this type of doctrine soon met with wide acceptance among the Providence and Newport Baptists.

From a remark in one of Williams's letters, it would seem that some members of the community had adopted radical views, involving universalism, such as the denial of the reality of hell, etc. But the chief matter of controversy was the doctrine of the imposition of hands. Roger Williams himself laid considerable stress upon this rite, and placed it alongside of baptism and the Supper, as following the former and a condition of properly receiving the latter. The matter was agitated among the General Baptists of England from 1646 onward, and many churches made the passing under hands a term of communion. Insistence on the imposition of hands was based on apostolic practice (as in Acts viii. 12, 19, and xix. 6, 7), and especially on Hebrews vi. 1, 2. "As God hath promised to give his Holy Spirit," wrote Thomas Grantham, one of the ablest leaders of the English General Baptists ("Christ. Primitiv.," bk. ii., pt. ii., chap. iii., p. 31), "to all that are called of the Lord, so he hath appointed a solemn way

wherein his servants and handmaids are to wait upon him for the reception thereof; which way is, the prayers of his church, performed by her ministers or pastors, with the laying on of hands; and this as a principle of Christ's doctrine, belonging to them in the minority of their Christian state." In England as in America the laying on of hands was the occasion of much bitter controversy, those who advocated it regarding it not merely as an appropriate symbol of the receiving of the Holy Spirit, which might be employed or dispensed with, but as a "foundation-principle" which could by no means properly be set aside. Finding it enumerated in Hebrews vi. 1, 2, among "the first principles of Christ," along with "repentance from dead works," "faith toward God," "the teaching of baptisms," "the resurrection of the dead," and "eternal judgment," they insisted upon its observance along with the acceptance of the other five principles. Thus arose what were called "Six Principle Baptists."

The controversy among the Providence Baptists had become so acute by 1652 that fellowship between those who considered the laying on of hands essential and those who either regarded it as a matter of indifference or rejected its use entirely was no longer possible. A division now took place, those who were for the recognition of only five principles following the leadership of Thomas Olney, while those who insisted on six principles gathered themselves around Brown, Wickenden, and Dexter. As there was nothing whatever in the way of a church building, nor anything the possession of which would identify the party possessing it with the original church to the exclusion of a like claim on the part of the opposite party, it seems futile to base an argument for the priority of another church on the supposition that one of these parties rather than the other was the original church, and that this orig-

inal church afterward became extinct. It has been assumed by some that Olney and his followers constituted the original church founded by Roger Williams, and that the party led by Brown and others constituted a new church, of which the present First Baptist Church of Providence is the continuation. The "original church," led by Olney, died. Therefore the First Baptist Church of Newport, organized in 1644, is the oldest Baptist church in America: Q. E. D.! The fact is that the party led by Chad Brown and others probably constituted a majority and most of the intelligence of the church, and so far as there was innovation in relation to the laying on of hands it was not in the practice of the ceremony, which seems to have prevailed from the beginning, but in making it a term of communion, which to men like Olney seemed to be going beyond the warrant of Scripture. Some of the constituent members of the church may have been Arminian in sentiment; by the time of the division the Arminians were probably in the majority.

The historical notices of the Providence Baptist leaders of this time are meager and unsatisfactory. Of Thomas Olney little more is known than that he was one of the constituent members of the Providence church; that he was among those expelled from the Salem church; that he had previously received from the Massachusetts authorities a "license to depart," which was in effect a decree of banishment (Felt, i., 334); that he was one of the leaders of the church after Williams's withdrawal; that he opposed the requirement of laying on of hands as unwarranted by Scripture; that he was a member of the committee appointed in 1647 to form a colonial government; that he was one of the "assistants" under the charter of 1663. ("Pub. Nar. Club," vi., 283). He continued to minister to his congregation till his death in 1682. (Backus, i.,

405 *seq.*) Olney's branch of the original church ceased to exist about 1720.

William Wickenden was probably the most active of the Six Principle leaders at the time of the division. He would seem to have been a man of good education, attractive manners, and considerable force of character. He came to Providence from Salem, where he had probably but recently arrived from England, before August, 1637 ("Pub. Nar. Club," vi., 329), and was among those who received the privileges of the community on the payment of thirty shillings. According to a writer in "Rippon's Annual Register" (1801-02, p. 797), he came to Providence in 1639. This date is followed by Farmer, Benedict, and Felt. According to Staples (Felt, i., 506), he became joint pastor, with Chad Brown, of the Providence Baptist church in 1642. We find him (1647), in view of the disturbed state of the community, joining with Roger Williams and six others in setting forth a document in the interests of peace and unity. They promise one another: "First, that the foundation in love may appear among us, what causes of difference have heretofore been given either by word or misbehavior, in public or private, concerning particular or general affairs, by any of us here present, not to mention or repeat them in the assembly, but that love shall cover the multitude of them in the grave of oblivion. Secondly, that union may proceed from love, we do promise to keep constant unto those several engagements made by us, both unto our town and colony, and to the uttermost of our powers and abilities to maintain our lawful rights and privileges, and to uphold the government of this plantation. Also, that love may appear in union, we desire to abandon all causeless fears and jealousies of one another, self-seeking and striving one against another, only aiming at the general peace and

union of this town and colony. Lastly, for our more orderly proceeding in this assembly, whereby love and union may appear in order, if in our consultations differences in judgment shall arise, then moderately in order, through argumentation, to agitate the same; considering the cause how far it may be hurtful, or conducing unto our union, peace, and liberty, and accordingly act, not after the will or person of any, but unto the justice and righteousness of the cause. Again, if such cause shall be presented wherein such difficulties shall appear that evident argument cannot be given for present satisfaction, but that either town or colony or both shall suffer, then to take into consideration a speech of a beloved friend: 'Better to suffer an inconvenience than a mischief'—better to suspend with a loss which may be inconvenient than to be totally disunited and bereaved of all rights and liberties, which will be a mischief indeed." (Backus, i., 167 *seq.*) It would seem that Wickenden was a member of the assembly; that serious differences of opinion existed among the signers of the covenant; that Wickenden was a man of more than ordinary influence in colonial affairs; and that he along with the other signers was willing in a truly Christian spirit to sink individual differences of opinion in the interests of the community. From a letter of Roger Williams to John Whipple, dated August 24, 1669 ("R. I. Hist. Tr.," xiv., 1881), it appears that for a time at least Wickenden's Arminianism assumed a somewhat Socinian hue: "I am sorry that you venture to play with the fire, and W. Wickenden is toasting himself in it, and my want of tongs to rake him out without burning my fingers, etc. You know who it is that counts you and us as fools for believing the Scriptures—namely, that there shall be any hell at all, or punishment for sin after this life. But I am content to be a fool with Jesus Christ, who tells

us of an account for every idle word in the day of judgment." We need not suppose that the whole of this damaging remark refers to Wickenden; but he was evidently entertaining views on important questions that Williams considered in the highest degree dangerous. A writer in "Rippon's Annual Register" (1802, p. 797) states that "he died February 23, 1670" (N. S.), after having removed to a place called Solitary Hill. Wickenden extended his labors to New York, where, in 1656, he was imprisoned for baptizing and administering the Lord's Supper at Flushing. After the division of the Providence church, in 1652, William Vaughan, a member of the Newport church, who had adopted the Six Principle position, went to Providence to receive the imposition of hands, and returned accompanied by Wickenden and Gregory Dexter. The aim of the three was probably to organize a Six Principle church at Newport. They were not immediately successful.

Gregory Dexter was for many years one of the most influential men in the colony. Beyond any of the Baptist citizens of Providence, perhaps, he was a man of affairs, and was much employed in the public service. It is not certain when he arrived at Providence. He is said to have received one of the "home lots," which would seem to establish his early presence. His name appears among the signers of the first compact of 1640, but may have been added at a later date. He was a printer and stationer of reputation in London, and had probably become noted as a zealous separatist. His flight from England is said to have been occasioned by the publication of a writing obnoxious to the government. Roger Williams's "Key to the Indian Language," published in London in 1643, bears his imprint. Benedict supposes that he did not reach Providence until 1644, which would be the natural

inference from the last-named fact, apart from decisive evidence of his earlier presence. He was one of the first experienced printers to come to America, and spent some time in Boston each year assisting in the publication of an almanac, notwithstanding the fact that he was a zealous Baptist and that Baptists were under the ban in Massachusetts. After the securing of the first charter he was a member of the committee from Providence to form a government. For years he was town clerk, and from time to time occupied the positions of commissioner for the town and deputy in the assembly. He was president of the colony in 1653. (Backus, ii., 491.) In 1654 he was appointed by the town to draw up, in association with Roger Williams, an address to Sir Henry Vane on the occasion of his retirement "from the helm of public affairs." The document was probably drafted by Williams, but it was signed by Dexter alone on behalf of the town. ("Pub. Nar. Cl.," vi., 266 *seq.*) During Williams's absence in England on colonial business, in 1652-53, he carried on a friendly correspondence with Dexter. A very affectionate and most interesting letter from Williams has been preserved. ("Pub. Nar. Cl.," vi., 235 *seq.*) Referring to Dexter's well-known proficiency in the printer's craft, he writes: "It hath pleased God so to engage me in divers skirmishes against the priests, both of Old and New England, so that I have occasioned using the help of printer-men, unknown to me, to long for my old friend." "Many friends have frequently, with much love, inquired after you." Williams commends his "poor companion" and their "many children," from whom he was obliged for so long a time to be absent, to Dexter's "love and faithful care." "Abundance of love remembered from abundance of friends to your dear self and your dearest." In 1669 Williams felt called upon to rebuke Dexter for his refusal

to pay certain taxes on the plea of conscientious scruples. Referring to this matter in a letter to John Whipple he writes: "The last night Shadrach Manton told me that I had spoken bad words of Gregory Dexter— . . . viz., that I said he makes a fool of his conscience. I told him I said so, and, I think, to our neighbor Dexter himself; for I believe he might as well be moderator or general deputy or general assistant as go so far as he does in many particulars; but what if I or my conscience be a fool, yet it is commendable and admirable in him, that, being a man of education and of a noble calling, and versed in militaries, that his conscience forced him to be such a child in his own house, when W. Har. strained for the rate (which I approve of) with such imperious insulting over his conscience, which all conscientious men will abhor to hear of. However, I commend that man, whether Jew or Turk or Papist or whoever, that steers no otherwise than his conscience dares, till his conscience tells him that God gives him a greater latitude. For, neighbor, you shall find it rare to meet with men of conscience, men that for fear and love of God dare not lie, nor be drunk, nor be contentious, nor steal, nor be covetous, nor voluptuous, nor ambitious, nor lazybodies, nor busybodies, nor dare displease God by omitting either service or suffering, though of reproach, imprisonment, banishment, and death, because of the fear and love of God." ("Pub. Nar. Cl.," vi., 328 *seq.*) A few weeks later, in a letter to Governor Winthrop: "Sir, I have encouraged Mr. Dexter to send you a limestone, and to salute you with this inclosed. He is an intelligent man, a master printer of London, and conscionable (though a Baptist), therefore maligned and traduced by William Harris (a doleful generalist). Sir, if there be any occasion of yourself (or others) to use any of this stone, Mr. Dexter hath a lusty team and lusty sons,

and very willing heart (being a sanguine, cheerful man), to do yourself or any (at your word especially) service upon my [*sic*; probably written *very*] honest and cheap considerations." (*Ibid.*, 332.) According to the writer of the article in "Rippon's Annual Register" (as above): "He was never observed to laugh, and seldom to smile. So earnest was he in the ministry that he could hardly forbear preaching when he came into a house or met a number of persons in the street. His sentiments were those of the Particular Baptists. He died in the ninety-first year of his age." The date of his death is given by Savage ("Genealogical Dictionary") as 1700. The statement that his sentiments were those of the Particular Baptists is questionable. It is certain that Wickenden, with whom he labored harmoniously, held to Arminian views; and insistence on the imposition of hands, in which Dexter joined, was characteristic of the General Baptists. Still it is not impossible that he differed, in a quiet way, from the majority of his Six Principle brethren as regards the universality of redemption and related doctrines, and on these points was in agreement with his lifelong friend, Roger Williams.

Chad Brown was probably of more importance to the Baptist cause in Providence than either of the leaders previously noticed. The fact that he was the ancestor of the four Brown brothers who in the eighteenth century contributed so largely of their time and their means to the advancement of the Baptist cause in Providence, and who gave their substance and their name to what was formerly Rhode Island College, has tended to keep his memory fragrant. He was one of the early settlers of Providence, being the first of those admitted to participation in the property and rights of the community after the original thirteen. Like most of the Providence men, he had left

Massachusetts for conscience' sake. Probably as early as 1642 he was among the leaders in the Baptist church, and was associated with Wickenden and Dexter in contending for the imposition of hands. He was among the four citizens chosen in 1640 to form a government. He had much to do with determining the bounds of the lands of the colony, and his efforts in this direction were regarded as highly beneficent. Roger Williams wrote of him in 1669 as "that noble spirit, now with God, Chad Brown." According to Dr. R. A. Guild, the highest living authority on Providence history, "his death was regarded by the colonists as a public calamity, for he had been the successful arbitrator of many differences, and had won the not unenviable reputation of being a peacemaker." He died about 1665.

Little that is memorable has been recorded with respect to the further history of the Providence church until the time of James Manning (1770 onward). Under Pastor Tillinghast, and largely at his own expense, the first meeting-house was erected in 1700. The most noted pastor of the period was probably Ebenezer Jenckes, whose brother was governor of the colony. He was born in Pawtucket in 1669 and ordained in 1719, and is said to have been the first American minister who preached in Providence. (Benedict, 453.) Governor Jenckes was himself a member of this church. He was for a number of years colonial ambassador to England. A son of the governor, Daniel Jenckes, was for forty-eight years an active member of the church and for forty years a member of the assembly, was chief-justice of the county, and was a liberal contributor to church and college. Among the other pastors of the period were Thomas Olney, Jr., and James Brown, grandson to Chad Brown.

CHAPTER III.

JOHN CLARKE AND THE BAPTISTS OF NEWPORT.¹

THOUGH second to the Providence church in point of date, the Newport church deserves the first place as regards the consistent and persistent devotion of its leaders to Baptist principles, the thoroughness and vigor of its organization, and its evangelistic zeal. The exact date of its organization cannot be determined. The latest admissible date is 1644, but there is some probability in favor of an earlier date. The founder and for many years the pastor of this church was John Clarke, who deserves a high place on the roll of Baptist worthies. Born in England (probably in Suffolk, possibly in Bedfordshire), October 8, 1609, highly educated in arts and in medicine (we know not where or how), a pronounced separatist before he left England (whether a pedobaptist or an antipedobaptist we are not informed), he arrived at Boston, November, 1637, hoping to find among those who had sought in the New World immunity from persecution a spirit of toleration. To quote his own account of his early experiences: "I was no sooner on shore but there appeared to me to be differences among them touching the Covenants; and in point of evidencing a man's good estate, some pressed hard for the Covenant of works, others pressed as

¹ Clarke, "Ill' News;" "Rec. of the Col. of R. I.," i.; Arnold, i.; Backus; Winthrop; Hubbard; Lechford; Barrows, "Hist. Sketch," "Dev. of Bapt. Pr. in R. I.," "Bapt. Qu.," 1872, pp. 483 *seq.*; J. C. C. Clarke, in "Bapt. Qu.," 1876, pp. 180 *seq.*; Adlam; Callender; Comer.

hard for the Covenant of grace that was established upon better promises, and for the evidence of the Spirit, as that which is a more certain, constant, and satisfactory witness. I thought it not strange to see men differ about matters of Heaven, for I expect no less upon Earth: But to see that they were not able so to bear with each other in their different understandings and consciences as in those utmost parts of the World to live peaceably together, whereupon I moved the latter, forasmuch as the land was before us and wide enough, with the proffer of Abraham to Lot, and for peace' sake, to turn aside to the right hand or to the left. The motion was readily accepted, and I was requested with some others to seek out a place." The controversy referred to was that over the so-called antinomian teachings of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson. In assuming the leadership of a new colony, the majority of whose members were in sympathy with Mrs. Hutchinson's views, and in which the Hutchinson family was embraced, Clarke in no way committed himself to the errors of the antinomians. He agreed with them in insisting on liberty of conscience; he believed that they ought to seek a place where they could hold their views in freedom; he was himself conscious of such a degree of incompatibility with the doctrines and the spirit of the Massachusetts theocracy that he could not hope peaceably to abide in the colony; and for the purpose of founding a new colony in which liberty of conscience should prevail he was willing to cast in his lot with these errorists.

Clarke's narrative continues: "Thereupon, by reason of the suffocating heat of the summer before, I went to the North [New Hampshire] to be somewhat cooler, but the winter following proved so cold that we were forced in the spring to make toward the South; so, having sought the Lord for direction, we all agreed that, while our vessel was

passing about a large and dangerous cape, we would cross over by land, having Long Island and Delaware Bay in our eye for the place of our residence; so to a town called Providence we came, which was begun by one M. Roger Williams (who for matter of conscience had not long before been exiled from the former jurisdiction), by whom we were courteously and lovingly received, and with whom we advised about our design." The result was that, after other places had been considered, with the approval of Williams and of the Plymouth magistrates they settled on the island of Aquidneck, soon afterward named Rhode Island. Through the kindly offices of Williams they were enabled to secure from the Indians a title to the island.

On the "7th day of the first month" (March, 1638) the colony was solemnly organized: "We whose names are underwritten do here solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a body politic, and, as he shall help, will submit our persons, lives, and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and to all those perfect and most absolute laws of his given us in his holy word of truth, to be guided and judged thereby." Nineteen names of the male members of the party follow, the list being headed by those of William Coddington and John Clarke. Coddington, who had had much experience in governmental matters in Massachusetts, was appointed judge or chief magistrate. He covenanted "to do justice and judgment impartially according to the laws of God, and to maintain the fundamental rights and privileges of this body politic."

It should be observed that at the time of the formation of this colony Roger Williams's Providence was still in a rudimentary state, with a population small in comparison with that of the Aquidneck colony, and with scarcely the beginnings of organized political life. The colony under

Clarke and Coddington was not only numerically far stronger than that under Williams, but it embraced far more of culture and of political experience and wisdom. Portsmouth was the first part of the island to be settled. In April, 1639, Coddington, Clarke, and others organized a new community at Newport. Portsmouth and Newport were reunited in 1640. In 1643, as already stated, Roger Williams was sent to England by the Rhode Island and Providence people conjointly to secure a charter. The charter was secured, but—partly, it may be, on account of the designation “Providence Plantations,” which may have seemed to give a certain ascendancy to Providence—the union of the three settlements under the charter did not take place till 1647.

It is interesting to note the stress that was laid—as seen in the first act of incorporation and in subsequent legislation—on the sole headship of Christ and on the principle of civil and religious liberty. While accepting the word of God as the embodiment of perfect and absolute laws by which they agreed to be guided and judged, they were careful to limit punishment for breaches of the laws of God to such as “tend to civil disturbance.” In 1641 it was “ordered, and unanimously agreed upon, that the government which this body politic doth attend unto in this Island, and the jurisdiction thereof in favor of our prince, is a DEMOCRACY, or popular government.” It was further ordered “that none be accounted a delinquent for DOCTRINE provided it be not directly repugnant to the government or laws established.” In September, 1641, it was ordered “that the law of the last court, made concerning liberty of conscience in point of doctrine, is perpetuated.” The toleration principles of the Rhode Islanders, as well as those of the Providence people, were soon put to a severe test. Samuel Gorton, a man of education and

ability, who represented antinomianism in some of its worst features, first at Portsmouth and then at Providence sought to overthrow the established forms of government and to arouse the people to revolt. His anarchism was grounded in his religious views; and with his thoroughly perverse but pretentious interpretation of Scripture, and his intense, magnetic personality, he was able to secure a considerable following. At Portsmouth he was whipped and expelled; while even Roger Williams opposed his receiving the privileges of citizenship at Providence and planned to move out of the colony himself should the favorers of Gorton succeed in securing his admission.

In the incorporation of Portsmouth, Newport, Providence, and Warwick, as "Providence Plantations, in Narragansett Bay, in New England," under the charter secured by Williams, Clarke was probably more influential than Williams himself. The model of government prepared by the islanders, in which Clarke's influence was no doubt predominant, was accepted substantially by the Providence representatives. ("Rec. of the Col. of R. I. and Prov. Plant.," i., 147 *seq.*) Roger Williams has received more credit than is his due for the Code of Laws adopted by the united colonies in 1647. They were certainly drawn up in substantially the form in which they were adopted by the islanders, and external and internal evidences point to Clarke as the principal author. In the preamble it is agreed and declared "that the form of Government established in Providence Plantations is DEMOCRATICAL; that is to say, a Government held by the free and voluntary consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants." The preamble closes: "And now to the end that we may give, each to other (notwithstanding our different consciences touching the truth as it is in Jesus, whereof upon the point we all make

mention), as good and hopeful assurance as we are able, touching each man's peaceable and quiet enjoyment of his lawful right and liberty, we do agree unto, and . . . enact, establish, and confirm, these orders following." The Code is, naturally, based upon English law, but it is in every way admirably adapted to the needs of the colonists. It would be impossible to find a document of the kind in which the rights of individuals and of the community are more carefully guarded. The document closes with these noble words, that have been quoted so often as to have become famous: "These are the Laws that concern all men, and these are the Penalties for the transgression thereof, which by common consent are Ratified and Established throughout this whole Colony; and otherwise than thus what is herein forbidden all men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God. And let the Saints of the Most High walk in this Colony without Molestation in the name of Jehovah, their God, forever and ever."

Although John Clarke did not write as voluminously on the doctrine of liberty of conscience as did Roger Williams, and although Williams was in advance of Clarke in publishing his views to the world, it is probable that Clarke had embraced these views some time before he knew of Williams. When he reached Boston in 1637 his indignation at the denial of liberty of conscience by the Massachusetts authorities was soon made manifest. That he was from this time onward as thoroughly mastered by this fundamental Baptist principle as was Williams himself is evident from his logical and comprehensive defense of this principle in his "Ill News from New England" (1652), as well as from his consistent adherence to this principle in his public life and in the legislation that he influenced from 1638 till his death in 1675. His argument for liberty

of conscience in the work referred to is so able and apt that it deserves some further notice. In expounding his position to the Massachusetts authorities in 1651, when along with Holmes and Crandall he was called upon to suffer for conscience' sake, he presented a brief summary of their views, which in the "Ill News" he has developed at some length: "I testify that no servant of Christ Jesus hath any liberty, much less authority, from his Lord, to smite his fellow-servant." This he proves by referring to Scripture passages in which brotherly love, meekness, lowliness, etc., are inculcated. "But to smite is an argument of a domineering, proud, and lofty spirit, which is far from a Spirit that is meek and lowly." He further refers to the injunction when smitten to turn the other cheek. "This Lord, being also that Prince of Peace, doth so far dislike such practices as these among any servants of his . . . that he hath absolutely and expressly declared that he by no means will have a striker to supply the office of an elder or steward therein, no, nor one that is of a lordly or domineering spirit, nor yet one that is froward and will be soon angry." He further testified, on the occasion referred to, that no servant of Christ has liberty or authority, "with outward force or arm of flesh, to constrain or restrain another's conscience, nor yet his outward man for conscience' sake, or worship of his God, etc." He claims that "if any servant of Christ Jesus . . . have any such liberty or authority from his Lord so to do, then he is able to shew it . . . either out of the words of the Lord himself, or out of those that were spoken or writ by the Apostles. . . . And indeed for a man to act in the name of the Lord, and not to have a word or warrant from him, is high presumption." He shows that there is no such word and that such conduct is a direct usurpation of the authority of Christ. Moreover, it is in sheer contradiction

of our Lord's command: "Do to others as ye would that others should do unto you." He holds that "to persecute, prosecute, or enforce others" is contradictory to Christ's representation of believers as lambs in the midst of wolves. "But the Lord hath reserved this great work of ordering the understanding and conscience, which is the spirit of man, by way of constraint or restraint; and also the outward man, with respect to the worship of God, . . . in his own hand, and in the hand of his Spirit, and hath intended to manage it as a part of his Kingdom, by his own Spirit, and by another manner of ministry than that which is put forth in the kingdoms of men." This proposition he proves by abundant citations of Scripture. Again: "That which presupposeth one man to have dominion over another man's conscience" he speaks of as "but a forcing of servants and worshipers upon the Lord, at the least, which he seeks not for, and is a ready way to make men dissemblers and hypocrites before God and man, which wise men abhor; and to put men upon the profaning the name of the Lord, that can no servant of Christ Jesus have any liberty, much less authority, from his Lord to do." He shows further that Christ Jesus "sharply reprov'd and checked his servants when he hath espied such a spirit as this breaking forth in them." Again: "That which of itself is inconsistent with the civil peace, liberty, prosperity, and safety of a place, commonwealth, or nation, no servant of Christ can have liberty, much less authority, from his Lord, to do. But this outward forcing of men in matters of conscience toward God to believe as others believe, and to practice and worship as others do, cannot stand with the peace, liberty, prosperity, and safety of a place, commonwealth, or nation. Therefore," etc. He maintains that there can be no peace in a commonwealth "so long as there is an outward force and power to be had to main-

tain and uphold the carnal interests and advantages of some upon religious accounts, and so prosecute others who for conscience' sake toward God dare not, yea, cannot, conform to their way. What hopes are thereby begotten and nourished in some? what jealousies, suspicions, and fears in others? what revengeful desires in most? yea, what plottings and contrivings in all? and as a fruit and effect hereof, what riding? running? troublesome and tumultuous assemblings together, and sidings? yea, and outrageous murderings and bloodsheddings are hereby produced in a nation, to gain that power and sword to their party, either to crush, suppress, or cause the other to conform, or at the least and best to save themselves from being crushed, suppressed, or forced to conformity?" He insists that by granting liberty of conscience "shall all parties be deeply obliged, to the utmost of their lives and estates, to bear up that power, without which they cannot expect to enjoy peace, liberty, and safety themselves."

From the beginning Clarke was the trusted counselor of the Rhode Island colonists. While he seems to have shrunk from occupying the highest position at home, his influence is manifest in every important measure, and whenever it became necessary to send a representative to England in the interests of colonial rights he was the chosen representative of the people. When William Codrington had without the approval of a majority of the citizens of the island secured in England a grant of the territory in his own right, Clarke was sent to England by Newport and Portsmouth to procure the annulling of the charter. In this undertaking he had the coöperation of Roger Williams, who acted on behalf of Providence and Warwick. Williams returned soon after the business had been accomplished, but for twelve years Clarke remained in England as the representative of the colonists and the

guardian of their rights. It was during this visit to England that he published "*Ill News from New England*," a work that did more than any other publication to call the attention of the world to the intolerance of New England Puritanism and the iniquity of such intolerance. In England he was closely associated with many of the leading men of the Cromwellian age, notably with John Milton, the Latin secretary, a radical in politics and religion.

Just how his time was employed during this long residence in the mother-land we are not informed; but it is probable that he was at the same time deepening the foundations of his theological, civic, and medical knowledge, and seeking to advance the cause of Christ in such ways as were open to him. The following contemporary notice, being a communication from the town of Warwick to the colonial council, is of interest: "We know that Mr. Clarke did publicly exercise his ministry in the Word of God in London, as his letters have made report, as that being a chief place for his profit and preferment, which, we doubt not, brought him in good means for his maintenance; as also he was much about modelizing of matters concerning the affairs of England, as his letters have declared, in which, no doubt, he was encouraged by men of no small estates, who, in all likelihood, did communicate liberally for such of his labors and studies." The stress laid upon his possible emoluments was due to the somewhat niggardly desire on the part of the town to be released from its proportion of the allowance made to Clarke for his services. Much of his time was no doubt given to the affairs of the colony, and after the accession of Charles II. he succeeded in securing a charter for "*Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*," in 1663. The charter of 1644, ratified in 1647, had never been satisfactory on account of the indefiniteness of its provisions. Disputes as to boundaries had

arisen which could scarcely be settled by other than British authority. Moreover, with the restoration of the Stuarts the acts of the revolutionary period had been nullified. This charter, though given by a king of despotic tendencies, who was at that very time bitterly persecuting dissenters, is one of the most remarkable, in its provisions for civil and religious liberty, ever issued by an English sovereign. It makes suitable acknowledgment of the Indian titles to the land; it declares "that no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be anywise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any difference in opinion in matters of religion which do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony; but that all and every person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgments and consciences in matters of religious concerns; . . . they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness and profaneness, nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others." The provisions of the earlier charter for government by a majority of the free-men of the colony are substantially confirmed in the new.

Rhode Island, through Clarke's diplomacy, secured the recognition of claims to territory disputed by Connecticut and Massachusetts. Clarke was bitterly opposed in his efforts to secure the charter by the representatives of Massachusetts and Connecticut, and these colonies were greatly chagrined by his success. It was natural that they should insinuate that this Baptist statesman, who had so ruthlessly exposed the intolerance of the Massachusetts authorities, had secured the charter by improper means. But the documentary history of the time fully vindicates Clarke, while it reflects gravely upon the methods of his traducers. (Arnold, i., 287 *seq.*)

There was universal rejoicing throughout Rhode Island and Providence Plantations that the aspirations of the colonists for liberty and for their rights in relation to the other colonies had been so amply secured by their honored and beloved agent. The bearer of the royally sealed document was handsomely rewarded for his fidelity. It was voted "that Mr. John Clarke, the Colony's agent in England, be saved harmless in his estate; and to that end that all his disbursements going to England, and all his expenses and engagements there already laid out, . . . as also . . . expenses and engagements he shall be necessitated yet further to disburse, . . . shall all be repaid, paid, and discharged by this Colony. . . . That in consideration of . . . his great pains, labor, and travail with much faithfulness exercised for above twelve years in behalf of this Colony, in England, the thanks of the Colony be sent unto him by the Governor and Deputy Governor; and for a gratuity unto him, the Assembly engage that the Colony shall pay unto the said John Clarke, . . . over and besides what is above engaged, the sum . . . of one hundred pound sterling." This was undoubtedly the crowning achievement of Clarke's civil career. The charter remained in force until 1843. From the time of its adoption Rhode Island was practically a free, democratic state, with the amplest provision for liberty of conscience.

The later public services of John Clarke must be passed over. His life was one of singular disinterestedness and self-devotion. Few men have been so prominently engaged in public affairs without arousing antagonisms among those with whom they have been associated. But so well balanced was his mind, so just were his judgments, so thorough was his understanding of human nature and of the problems of his time, so evident was it to all that he

was seeking no private ends at the expense of others, that he seems to have been universally honored, trusted, and beloved. If enemies he had they were the enemies of his religion and of his colony.

But the aspect of his life which justifies his introduction into the present work has as yet been barely touched upon. John Clarke was a Baptist of the completest and purest type, the most important American Baptist of the century in which he lived. When or under what circumstances he adopted Baptist views seems not to have been recorded. There is some probability in favor of the supposition that he came to America a Baptist. The fact that we have no intimation of any change in his views, or of his baptism in New England, is so far favorable to this supposition. He may have had his attention called to the matter by Roger Williams, who, about a year after Clarke's first visit to Providence, introduced believers' baptism and organized a Baptist church. He may have been baptized by Mark Lukar, one of the earliest of the English Particular Baptists, who is said to have been one of the founders of the Newport church, and who for many years nobly served the church as a ruling elder. At any rate this connecting-link between the first Particular Baptist church of England and the second of America, hitherto overlooked, is a matter of no small interest. If Robert Lenthall, who was driven from Weymouth, Mass., for erroneous views in 1638, and who accepted citizenship at Newport in 1640, was a Baptist, Clarke may have been influenced by him; but the account we have of Lenthall's views leaves us in doubt as to his precise position.

Clarke began his ministry on the island soon after his arrival. Winthrop designates him, in 1638, as "a physician and preacher to those of the island." The colonists were not long in building a meeting-house at the common

expense, and a church was soon organized, on what basis we are not informed. A number of those who had been members of the Boston church, and had incurred censure on account of their sympathy with Mrs. Hutchinson and her views, were members of this church.

. By 1640-41 religious dissension had become acute. A number of the islanders carried their antinomian views to their extreme consequences, and, if correctly represented, sought to promulgate a licentious pantheism. Easton, Coddington, and Coggeshall represented the antinomian position and were opposed by Clarke, Lenthall, Harding, and others. "Professed Anabaptists," according to Winthrop, appeared on the island as early as 1641. He is probably in error in representing the Anabaptists of the island as denying magistracy, the bearing of arms, and the existence of true churches, and maintaining the necessity of special apostolic intervention in order to the constitution of such. It seems to have been some of the antinomians that held to these views. As like views were currently attributed to the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and as men of Winthrop's stamp were looking for the development of such views among contemporary Baptists, it was natural that when he learned that there were Baptists on the island, and that there were advocates of these views of magistracy, warfare, and church constitution, he should have taken it for granted that the two sets of views belonged to the same party. It is probable that the antipedobaptists, under Clarke's leadership, began to hold separate meetings in 1641. In a MS. copy of Lechford's "Plain Dealing" (written probably in 1641) it is stated that "at the island called Aquedny are about one hundred families. There is a church where one Master Clarke is Pastor. . . . The place where the church is is called Newport." In the printed work (1642) the number of

inhabitants is given as two hundred, and after "Newport" is added, "but the church, I hear, is now dissolved; as also divers churches in the country have been broken up and dissolved through dissension." It is evident that religious affairs on the island were in great confusion about 1641-42, and it is probable that at this time a more general congregation to which Clarke ministered was broken up, and that the antipedobaptist members now began a separate meeting. An early tradition, put on record by John Comer in the next century, places the organization of the church in the year 1644. It is probable that the Baptist meeting, begun in 1641 or 1642, assumed more completely the character of a church in 1644.

Samuel Hubbard, a well-educated and deeply spiritual man, having lived for a number of years in Connecticut, where he embraced Baptist views, removed to Newport and was received by baptism, along with his wife, into the Newport church in November, 1648. He thus describes their experience at Fairfield, Conn.: "God having enlightened both, but mostly my wife, into his holy ordinance of baptizing only visible believers, and being zealous for it, she was mostly struck at, and answered twice publicly, where I was also said to be as bad as she, and threatened with imprisonment to Hartford gaol, if we did not renounce it or remove. That Scripture came into our minds, 'If they persecute you in one place, flee to another.'" He conducted an extensive correspondence, private and on behalf of the church, and to his letters we are indebted for much valuable information with reference to the religious history of the time. He was a lifelong friend of Roger Williams and frequently exchanged views with him in correspondence. In 1665 Stephen Mumford, an English Seventh-Day Baptist, united with the church and propagated his views so industriously that Hubbard,

Hiscox, and others were soon zealous Sabbatarians. At last they became so convinced of the sinfulness of the neglect of the Sabbath (which they regarded as an ordinance of God, binding for all time and transferred by no Scriptural warrant to the first day), and by consequence so censorious and intolerant of the common practice, that in 1671 a Seventh-Day Baptist church was formed at Newport.

Two of Clarke's brothers, Thomas and Joseph, appear among the early members of the Newport church. The latter became somewhat prominent in the affairs of the colony. The first deacon appears to have been William Weeden, and Mark Lukar was designated a "ruling elder." The Baptist cause at Seekonk, Mass., led by Obadiah Holmes, was fostered by Clarke and his brethren, who visited the community for preaching and the administration of baptism. After the meeting had been broken up by the authorities most of the members removed to Newport, where they formed a valuable accession to the church. The evangelistic visit of Clarke, Holmes, and Crandall to Lynn, Mass., to minister to an aged and infirm Baptist, William Witter by name, and possibly to assist others who were inclined to the Baptist way, with the cruel persecution that they suffered there, may be reserved for the next chapter. This occurred in the summer of 1651. Clarke was soon afterward sent to England as agent of the colony. During his prolonged absence the work was carried on by Obadiah Holmes and Joseph Torrey, the latter as well as the former one of the Seekonk company. Shortly after Clarke's departure controversy arose with reference to the laying on of hands. Soon after the division in Providence on the ground of this ceremony, in 1652, William Vaughan, a member of the Newport church, who had adopted Six Principle views, visited Providence to submit to the laying on of hands and to arrange for a Six Princi-

ple propaganda in Newport. He returned accompanied by Wickenden and Dexter. The time did not prove ripe for the establishment of a new congregation, but from this time onward an active and aggressive minority favored insistence on the six principles, and in 1656 a new church was formed on this basis.

After his return in 1664 Clarke resumed the leadership of the congregation and was ably assisted by Holmes, Torrey, Lukar, and Weeden, who for so many years had been among the chief burden-bearers in the church. Next to Clarke, Torrey was the most prominent man among the Baptists of the island in civil affairs, having been at one time attorney-general and for years general recorder. The church was sadly afflicted in 1676 by the death of four of its standard-bearers. Torrey died early in the year, and was followed in April by Clarke, in October by Weeden, and in December by Lukar. The church had already suffered two schisms, and the Quaker agitation had hindered its progress. When these four noted men had been removed by death, those who remained may well have felt discouraged.

Obadiah Holmes, already a septuagenarian (he was born about 1606), succeeded to the pastorate and retained it till his death in 1682. He was well educated, and had for many years, at great personal cost, labored in the Baptist cause. The narrative of his sufferings in Massachusetts in 1651 will be found in the next chapter. Among the more noted members of the church during the latter part of the century was John Cooke, who had been a Congregational minister in the Plymouth colony, and who was converted to Baptist views before 1680 by reading the "Narrative" of Elder Russell, of the Boston church. As a boy he was among the passengers of the "Mayflower" and was still living in 1694. Another prominent member

was Philip Edes, who, according to Samuel Hubbard, was "one in office in Oliver's [Cromwell's] house, was for liberty of conscience, a merchant, a precious man, of a holy life and conversation, beloved of all sorts of men, his death much bewailed by all." As has already been made evident, the First Baptist Church of Newport was strictly Calvinistic in doctrine. A correspondence with the Particular Baptists of England was kept up, and the relations of the church with the Swansea and Boston churches were most intimate.

About 1687 the church secured the services of a young Englishman, Richard Dingley by name, who had spent some time in Boston, and who came to Newport recommended by Boston Baptists. Thomas Skinner, pastor of the Boston church, assisted at his ordination. After about seven years of service he removed to South Carolina. For a number of years the church was without a regular pastor and its vital forces seem to have run very low. William Peckham, a member of the church, became pastor in 1711. In 1718 an Englishman named Daniel White was appointed assistant pastor, and by his rashness in administering the ordinances, though himself unordained, and his disposition to disregard the rights of the less aggressive and probably less intelligent pastor, the church was thrown into confusion. The result was that White and his friends withdrew and formed a separate congregation in 1724. The new church did not prosper, and when White abandoned the enterprise in 1728 it is said that "the only surviving member that he left behind him was a solitary woman."

Unwisely, as it would seem, Peckham, who must have been from age or other causes utterly unfitted for the leadership of the church, continued to sustain the relation of elder or head pastor until his death in 1732.

The pastorate of John Comer was in many respects a successful one, but it ended unpleasantly. Comer came to the church (1725) as a young man of twenty-one, yet with a maturity far beyond his years. A native of Boston, he had had his preparatory training at Cambridge and had studied at Yale College. He had a profound experience of divine grace when he was seventeen years of age, and a year afterward "was received into full communion with the [Congregational] church in Cambridge." He had probably already resolved to devote himself to the gospel ministry. A short time afterward a "near companion" of his "embraced the principle of believers' baptism . . . and was baptized by Mr. E. Callender, in Boston." On remonstrating with his friend for abandoning what he regarded as a divine institution, Comer was induced to read Joseph Stennett's treatise on baptism. It was his expectation that he would find many flaws in it and that by pointing these out he would be able to win his friend from the error of his way. He "resolved to turn to every Scripture quoted, and not to take any one without." In so doing he found that he "had never duly considered the viii. of the Acts, the iii. of Matthew, and the vi. of Romans, and such like places. Hereupon I got (though privately) books on the other side of the controversy and found them, if weighed in the balance, wanting." The result was a great inner conflict. He was convinced that his baptism was defective, and yet he shrank from severing his otherwise happy relations with the Congregationalists. It was not until he had pursued his studies at Yale that he resolved to follow the path of duty in this matter. In January, 1725, he was baptized by Elisha Callender, and shortly afterward entered the Baptist ministry. He soon had his choice between the pastorate of the Swansea and that of the Newport church. Through much prayer

and the helpful counsel of Callender he decided in favor of Newport. In March, 1726, he was ordained to the ministry by Elder Peckham and Deacon Maxwell. The church had dwindled down to a membership of eighteen—ten men and eight women. Comer kept a minute diary, and we are indebted to him for much interesting information about the Baptists of his time. His researches into the history of the earlier time have likewise been of great use to later investigators. He informs us that there were in Newport at this time seven congregations: "Two Baptist churches, one under hands, Mr. James Clarke and Mr. Daniel Wightman, Pastors. My flock. . . . One Seventh-Day church, Mr. Joseph Crandall, Pastor. One congregation under the care of Mr. Daniel White" (already mentioned), and congregations of Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Quakers, the last "very large." The anti-nomians of the early time had for the most part become Quakers.

The early stages of Comer's ministry were highly prosperous. He surpassed most of his contemporaries in evangelistic zeal and gifts. During the first year twenty-four were added to the church. The church contributed for the support of the pastor during the first year more than £85, during the second year more than £93, while in the third year the pastor's income had fallen to £38. The support given was generous for the time, and the falling off was due to the fact that the pastor had adopted the doctrine of the laying on of hands. Congregational singing, repudiated by many Baptist churches of the time, especially those of the Arminian persuasion, was introduced into the Newport church through Comer's influence. Though young in years and in the pastoral office, Comer's reputation soon became so widespread that he was often applied to for counsel even from remote parts

of the country. His evangelistic zeal led him to extend his labors far beyond Newport and Rhode Island.

The adoption of the doctrine of the laying on of hands as an obligatory ordinance involved serious embarrassment for the pastor and the church. The chief difficulty of the pastor lay in the fact that while he sympathized with the Six Principle churches in this particular doctrine he was strongly opposed to their Arminianism. Moreover, he had built a needlessly expensive house and had become heavily involved in debt. The church could not, of course, be expected to sit patiently under the preaching of doctrine that they believed to be erroneous. On January 9th he records: "I passed under hands by Mr. Daniel Wightman, and offered for transient communion until Spring, or till I saw how God in his Holy Providence might dispose of me."

For more than two years he was without a settled charge, though for most of the time he preached once each Lord's Day for the Six Principle church at Newport. Here also his ministry was fruitful; for forty were added to the church during one year, the largest addition the church had ever had in any year of its history. At the close of his engagement it numbered 150 and was by far the largest church in the colony. His "preaching the doctrines of grace" proved an obstacle to his permanent settlement there. After a tour of the churches of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, where the Particular Baptist churches practiced the laying on of hands, he assisted in organizing a church on a like basis in Rehoboth, Mass. (January, 1732), where he labored happily and successfully till his death (May 23, 1734).

Comer gives us an account of a meeting at Newport (June 21, 1729) of the "Yearly Association" of the General (Six Principle) Baptists. He speaks of it as "the largest

Convention that ever hath been," thus intimating that this was far from being its first meeting. Besides the Newport and Providence churches, the churches of New York, Groton, Conn., Dartmouth, R. I., New London, Conn., and South Kingston, R. I., were represented. There were thirty-two delegates present—eight ministers, three deacons, and twenty-one brethren. "There are of churches in communion thirteen distinct bodies. In Providence, besides those mentioned, there are two under the care of Mr. Peter Place [and] Mr. Samuel Fisk. In the town of Swanzey one under the care of Mr. Joseph Maxson. In the town of Warwick one under the care of Mr. Manasseh Martin. In North Kingston one under the care of Mr. Richard Sweet. 'Tis supposed there were 250 communicants and 1000 auditors. Each of these held the Doctrine of General Redemption. There are three other churches that hold the Doctrine of Free Grace. One at Newport, . . . formerly my flock. One at Swanzey under the care of Mr. Ephraim Wheaton. One at Boston under the care of Mr. Elisha Callender. There are two churches in the observation of the Seventh Day. One at Westerly under the care of Mr. Joseph Maxson. One at Newport under the care of Mr. Joseph Crandal."

John Callender, a nephew of Elisha Callender, and like him a graduate of Harvard, was called to the pastorate of the First Church, Newport, in 1730, a youth of twenty-one. He continued in this relation till his death in 1748. On the occasion of the centennial of the settlement of the island (March, 1738) Callender preached an historical sermon, which is said to have been the first attempt to collect and arrange the materials relating to the early history of the colony. It is still regarded as a masterpiece.

CHAPTER IV.

BAPTISTS IN MASSACHUSETTS TO 1652.¹

IN reviewing the dealings of the Massachusetts authorities with Roger Williams we have learned something of their attitude toward aggressive and pertinacious dissent, whether in civil or in religious matters. The Massachusetts Bay leaders were nonconforming Puritans, and they had secured their charter with the full understanding that they did not repudiate the Church of England and were far removed from separatism of any kind. They sought to be regarded "as those who esteem it our honor to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear mother; and cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart and many tears in our eyes; ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom, and sucked it from her breasts." Under Laud's domineering in England it would have been impossible for a body of avowed separatists to secure a charter or to get permission to leave the country. Even the Salem company, which represented a more thoroughgoing type of dissent, had thought it advisable to repudiate separatism, and had refused passage on their vessel to Ralph Smith, who was coming out as pastor of the semi-separatist followers of John Robinson, who

¹ Cf. Backus, Clarke, "Ill News," Winslow, "Good News," Winthrop, Ellis, Morton, Mather, Hutchinson. Adams, Felt, Palfrey.

constituted the older Plymouth colony. "We will not say," they wrote, "as the Separatists were wont to say at their leaving of England, Farewell, Babylon! Farewell, Rome! but we will say, Farewell, dear England! Farewell, the Church of God in England, and all the Christian friends there! We do not go to New England as Separatists from the Church of England; though we cannot but separate from the corruptions in it; but we go to practice the positive part of church reformation, and propagate the gospel in America." The Salem colony soon came under the influence of the Plymouth settlement, and it was not long before the pastor of the Salem church was refusing the Lord's Supper to such leaders of the Massachusetts Bay company as Winthrop, Dudley, Johnson, and Codrington, and declining to baptize the child of the last-named, because they had not yet become members of any particular "reformed church"; while he had welcomed to communion a member of an English separatist congregation and had baptized his child.

The Massachusetts Bay authorities failed utterly to recognize the practicability of tolerating any marked differences of doctrine or practice. To allow companies of believers to organize themselves for worship on any other basis than that adopted by the party in the majority, or to allow individuals to propagate freely views opposed to those of the recognized churches, could result only in confusion and disaster as regards the colonies themselves, and in such a reputation in England as would result in the withdrawal of the charter, the sending out of an unfriendly governor, or even the recall and punishment of the colonists. The leaders of Massachusetts were peculiarly sensitive about the sending of adverse reports to England. In fact they deprecated the reporting of the actual state of things, and they took every precaution to prevent the

settlement of such as would be likely to injure the reputation of the colonies by unfriendly representations. As early as May, 1631, a regulation was adopted by the General Court that "for time to come no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same." This excluded Baptists from all civil privileges. The freeman's oath, referred to in the chapter on Roger Williams, was intended as a means of rigorously excluding all who should fall short of loyalty to existing arrangements.

The case of Roger Williams had scarcely been disposed of when the Massachusetts colonies were convulsed with another religious controversy that was soon to involve the whole of New England. Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, with her husband, had been attracted to Boston from England by the person and the teachings of John Cotton, the leading Boston minister, and had arrived in September, 1634. Her brother-in-law, John Wheelwright, had followed in May, 1636. Mrs. Hutchinson was one of the most striking religious characters of the time. Endowed with a rare personality and with a spirit of helpfulness which gave her remarkable influence over the women among whom she moved, she was able at the same time to win a number of the most prominent men of New England to her views. The teachings of Mrs. Hutchinson and her followers are commonly designated antinomianism. They laid great stress upon the covenant of grace as opposed to the covenant of works. They regarded the current Puritanism, with its rigorous discipline and its scrupulous attention to the outer life, as Pharisaic legalism. They insisted on the paramount importance of the inner life. If by a mystical union with Christ our natures are transformed, the outer life cannot fail to be holy; if the tree be made good, the fruit will be

of like character. They made much of visions and revelations, and claimed to be in so complete fellowship with God as to be responsive to every prompting of his Spirit. It was the old mysticism of the middle ages, modified no doubt, directly or indirectly, by the teachings of Schwenckfeldt, David Joris, and Henry Nicholas. The last-named had secured a considerable following in England, and his writings had been translated and widely circulated. Familism was the name given to his system, and it represented a pantheistic type of mysticism, somewhat like that of the medieval Beghards. While the tendency of such teachings is undoubtedly toward fanaticism and licentiousness, it is gratifying to know that the New England antinomians compared favorably with their orthodox neighbors in point of morality and well-doing. John Cotton, Williams's chief opponent and one of the ablest theologians of the time, was the favorite preacher of the Boston antinomians during Mrs. Hutchinson's residence there, while Wilson, his colleague, was regarded as a mere legalist. Sir Henry Vane, the governor, sided enthusiastically with the antinomians, while John Winthrop, the deputy governor, took a determined stand against innovation. The antinomians were strong in Boston and its immediate vicinity; but orthodoxy prevailed in the Massachusetts colonies at large. After much controversy Mrs. Hutchinson and Wheelwright were banished, and various penalties and disabilities, including disarmament, were inflicted on those that had manifested sympathy with their teachings. Cotton himself was brought into a very embarrassing situation by reason of the partiality of the antinomians for his preaching and the sympathy he had expressed for some of the views of Mrs. Hutchinson and Wheelwright; and having been censured for his course, he felt obliged to apologize in a way not wholly creditable to his consistency or his

courage. The attitude of John Clarke toward the antinomians and their persecutors was referred to in the last chapter. Among the leaders of the movement was William Coddington, who had occupied a high civil position in Massachusetts, who became a chief opponent of Roger Williams in civil matters, who was for a time governor of the Rhode Island and Providence Plantations colony, and who became a leader among the Quakers.

Reference has already been made to the settlement of the antinomians and their friends in Rhode Island. It does not concern us here to narrate the disputes that arose between the islanders and the Providence people.

Three considerations justify this brief mention of the antinomian movement: (1) the fact that the controversy in Massachusetts and the rigorous methods adopted in dealing with the antinomians formed a prelude to the series of persecuting measures that were soon to be inaugurated against the Baptists; (2) the fact that the Massachusetts leaders saw in the mystical enthusiasm of the antinomians a recurrence of phenomena with which they had become familiar in their reading of the history of Anabaptists of the Münster type; and (3) the fact that in the case of some at least sympathy with the teachings of Mrs. Hutchinson and disgust with the intolerance of the Massachusetts authorities formed a transition to the Baptist position, while others, dominated by the mystical element in the teachings of Mrs. Hutchinson, found their resting-place in Quakerism, with its emphasizing of the inner light and its repudiation of external ordinances.

The early Puritans of New England (as of Old) knew nothing of "Baptists." The opponents of infant baptism were in their eyes "Anabaptists." Their knowledge of Anabaptists was limited to the grossly exaggerated accounts of the fanatics of the Münzer and the Münster types.

They were quite willing to admit that individual opponents of infant baptism might be to all outward seeming quiet, peaceable Christians; but they were fully convinced that the logic of the antipedobaptist position led inevitably to the overthrow of all social order, with the denial of magistracy, oaths, the right of the civil government to censure religious offenses, and, under favorable circumstances, to such fanatical outbreaks as that of Münster. One has only to read such works as Featley's "*The Dippers Dipt*" (1644), Edwards's "*Gangræna*" (1646), Baillie's "*A Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time*" (1645), Paget's "*Heresiography*" (1645), and the earlier continental Latin works on which these based their statements with reference to Anabaptists, to realize the horror which the name "*Anabaptist*" awakened in the souls of such men as Cotton, Hooker, Winthrop, and Endicott. So much must be said in order to account for the rancorous hatred of Baptists by the New England theocratic leaders, their lack of judicial fairness in dealing with radical dissentients of all types, and their determination, even by the infliction of the cruelest penalties, if need be, to exterminate heresy.

Salem, where Roger Williams's influence had been brought most powerfully to bear, was in the earlier time the chief nursery of antipedobaptist sentiments. During the years 1636-39 those who entertained decided antipedobaptist views had followed Williams to Providence. After he had ceased to identify himself with the Baptists, and especially after strife had arisen in the Providence church, there would be less to attract them thither. Newport after 1644 was a more attractive refuge.

As early as 1638, at Weymouth, Robert Lenthall, afterward active in Newport, attracted attention by his views. "Only baptism," he held, "was the door of entrance into

the visible church." ("Mass. Hist. Coll.," 2d series, v., 275.) According to Hubbard, "the common sort of people did eagerly embrace his opinions." He is said to have zealously striven "to get such a church on foot as all baptized ones might communicate in." It is not quite clear, however, that his views were Baptist.

The earliest assured case of theocratic censure on the ground of antipedobaptist error occurred December 14, 1642, at the Salem Quarterly Court. The record runs: "The Lady Deborah Moody, Mrs. King, and the wife of John Tilton were presented for holding that the baptizing of infants is no ordinance of God." Winthrop reports the matter more fully as regards the principal offender: "The Lady Moody, a wise and anciently religious woman, being taken with the error of denying baptism to infants, was dealt withal by many of the elders and others, and admonished by the church of Salem (whereof she was a member); but persisting still, and to avoid further trouble, etc., she removed to the Dutch, against the advice of all her friends. Many others infected with anabaptism removed thither also. She was after excommunicated." Winthrop does not inform us what Lady Moody's friends advised her to do under the circumstances, but as they would scarcely have advised her to face the determined opposition of the authorities, which would have resulted in formal banishment, with death as the penalty of returning, they must have advised her to abandon her views or at least any aggressive assertion of them. We shall meet Lady Moody and her followers hereafter in their Long Island home.

The next case on record seems to be that of William Witter, who had probably been influenced by Lady Moody, his neighbor. The date of his arraignment before the Salem Court was February 28, 1644 (N. S.). The

record reads: "For entertaining that the baptism of infants was sinful, [W. W.] now coming in Salem Court, answered humbly and confessed his ignorance, and his willingness to see light, and (upon Mr. Morris, our Elder, his speech) seemed to be staggered." He was charged with having called "our ordinance of God a badge of the whore." He is sentenced "on some lecture day, the next fifth day being a public fast, to acknowledge his fault, . . . and enjoined to be here next Court at Salem."

Witter's antipedobaptist zeal, however, seems by no means to have been abated by this somewhat moderate censure. A later record runs: "At the Court at Salem, held the 18th of the 12th month, 1645 [February, 1646, N. S.], William Witter, of Lynn, was presented by the grand jury for saying that they who stayed whiles a child is baptized do worship the devil. Henry Collins and Nat. West dealing with him thereabouts, he further said that they who stayed at the baptizing of a child did take the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in vain, broke the Sabbath, and confessed and justified the former speech." He was sentenced "to make public confession to satisfaction in the open congregation at Lynn, or else to answer at the next General Court." Failing to comply with either of these conditions, he was afterward sentenced to appear "at the next Court of Assistants, at Boston, there to answer, and to be proceeded with according to the merit of his offense." The forbearance of the court in the case of Witter was due, it may be supposed, not wholly to their unwillingness to resort to harsher methods in case of need, but to the fact that he was a man of little personal influence. If he had been a successful propagator of his views banishment would certainly have been inflicted.

On July 5, 1644, according to Winthrop, "A poor man of Hingham, one Painter, . . . was now on the sudden

turned Anabaptist, and having a child born, he would not suffer his wife to bring it to the ordinance of baptism. Being presented for this, and enjoined to suffer the child to be baptized, he still refusing, and disturbing the church, he was again brought to the Court, not only for his former contempt, but also for saying that our baptism was anti-christian; and in the open Court he affirmed the same. Whereupon, after much patience and clear conviction of his error, etc.—because he was very poor, so as no other but corporal punishment could be fastened upon him—he was ordered to be whipped, not for his opinion, but for his reproaching the Lord's ordinance, and for his bold and evil behavior both at home and in the Court. He endured his punishment with much obstinacy, and when he was loosed he said, boastingly, that God had marvelously assisted him." This is not the first case in which persecutors of Christ's chosen ones have been so swayed by their prepossessions as to make light of their sufferings and their faith, and to attribute their heroic bearing to mere obstinacy. It is an old trick of Roman Catholic persecutors. The statement that Painter was punished not for his opinion but for his reproaching the Lord's ordinance, etc., is too transparently casuistical to require discussion. Surely the fact that antipedobaptist views, unexpressed and kept in abeyance even when one's own infant was involved, were tolerated, is a slender basis for a claim of forbearance.

Cases of pronounced antipedobaptism were now becoming so common, and the Baptist cause was making so rapid progress in Providence and Newport, that specific legislation against Baptists was felt to be desirable. On November 13, 1644, the following law was promulgated: "Forasmuch as experience hath plentifully proved that since the first arising of the Anabaptists, about a hundred

years since, they have been the incendiaries of commonwealths and the infecters of persons in main matters of religion, and the troublers of churches in all places where they have been, and that they who have held the baptizing of infants unlawful have usually held other errors or heresies together therewith, though they have (as other heretics used to do) concealed the same till they spied out a fit advantage and opportunity to vent them, by way of question or scruple, and whereas divers of this kind have, since our coming into New England, appeared amongst ourselves, some whereof have (as others before them) denied the ordinance of magistracy and the lawfulness of making war, and others the lawfulness of magistrates and their inspection into any breach of the first table, which opinions, if they should be connived at by us, are like to be increased among us, and so must necessarily bring guilt upon us, infection and trouble to the churches, and hazard to the whole commonwealth, it is ordered and agreed that if any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall either openly condemn or oppose the baptism of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of the ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy or their lawful right or authority to make war or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, and shall appear to the Court willfully and obstinately to continue therein after due time and means of conviction, every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment."

The statement that some of the antipedobaptists of New England "denied the ordinance of magistracy and the lawfulness of making war" is unsupported. In none of the cases recorded is there the slightest hint of the holding of such views. No one of the Baptists of New England can

be shown to have held to or taught anything of the kind. The statement of the statute may possibly be accounted for in one of the following ways, or by a combination of these: 1. The authorities may have confounded Anabaptists with antinomians. The antinomians were charged with holding and promulgating a number of errors that were precisely adapted to the purpose of supplementing the errors of the Baptists and constituting them full-fledged Anabaptists of the dreaded type. Some of those who had been more or less closely associated with the antinomians had become Baptists in their Rhode Island home. Winthrop had written in 1641: "Mrs. Hutchinson and those of Aquiday Island broached new heresies every year. Divers of them turned professed Anabaptists, and would not wear any arms, and denied all magistracy among Christians, and maintained that there were no churches since those founded by the apostles and evangelists, nor could any be, nor any pastors ordained nor seals administered but by such, and that the church was to wait these all the time she continued in the wilderness, as yet she was." This statement is a most confused one and was probably based upon misinformation. "Those who turned professed Anabaptists," so far as we know them, were different persons from those who embraced the errors referred to. The incongruity of applying the term "Anabaptist" to those who held that the valid administration of the ordinances was, under existing circumstances, an impossibility, is manifest. Roger Williams, in adopting this view, withdrew from fellowship with the Baptist church he had founded. But even Williams was far from rejecting magistracy. The law against Baptists was probably framed by the writer of this confused statement. Even the antinomians, though they held peculiar views with respect to magistracy, and were charged even by Roger

Williams with rejecting it, repudiated the charge. 2. The statement may have been made, not on the ground of alleged utterances by Baptists, but by way of logical inference from avowed views. The Massachusetts authorities supposed themselves to be such masters of the anatomy of sects that from a single feature they could infer the entire structure. The denial of the right of magistrates to interfere with matters of conscience, or to concern themselves in any way with breaches of "the first table," no doubt seemed to them to involve denial of the right of magistrates to do anything effective. Of course it is not impossible that some individual of the time should have combined the rejection of infant baptism with denial of magistracy and of the lawfulness of war on the part of Christians. But all the Baptists of New England that we know anything about were quite ready to serve their fellow-citizens in any offices to which they might be called, and they were ready when occasion offered to do their full share of fighting.

During the struggle with the antinomians a law had been passed prohibiting newcomers from remaining in the colony above three weeks without a license. In October, 1645, a petition was presented to the court for the alteration of this law, as well as of that against the Anabaptists. The record of the action of the court in the premises is: "The Court hath voted that the laws mentioned should not be altered at all, nor explained." Evidently some of the citizens besides the avowed Baptists were coming to feel that banishment was too severe a penalty for religious dissent, and were bold enough to say so. To fortify the court in its attitude toward Baptists seventy-eight residents of Dorchester, Roxbury, etc., petitioned in May, 1646, "for the continuance of such orders, without abrogation or weakening, as are in force against

Anabaptists and other erroneous persons." This petition, it is needless to say, was "granted." In October, 1648, the court was "informed of great misdemeanor committed by Edward Starbuck, of Dover, with profession of Anabaptistry, for which he is to be proceeded against at the next Court of Assistants if evidence can be prepared by that time."

The following record is interesting as containing an account of an important Baptist movement in the Plymouth colony, and also as illustrating the zeal with which the Massachusetts Bay authorities carried their activity against "Anabaptists" beyond their own jurisdiction. The date of this letter to the Plymouth authorities is October, 1649:

"Honored and beloved Brethren: We have heard heretofore of divers Anabaptists arisen up in your jurisdiction, and connived at; but being but few, we well hoped that it might have pleased God, by the endeavors of yourselves and the faithful elders with you, to have reduced such erring men again into the right way. But now, to our great grief, we are credibly informed that your patient bearing with such men hath produced another effect, namely, the multiplying and increasing of such errors, and we fear maybe of other errors also, if timely care be not taken to suppress the same. Particularly we understand that within this few weeks there have been at Sea Cunk thirteen or fourteen persons rebaptized (a swift progress in one town), yet we hear not if any effectual restriction is intended thereabouts. Let it not, we pray you, seem presumption in us to mind you hereof, nor that we earnestly entreat you to take care as well of the suppressing of errors as of the maintenance of truth, God equally requiring the performance of both at the hands of Christian magistrates, but rather that you will consider our interest is concerned therein. The infection of such diseases being

so near are likely to spread into our jurisdiction. . . . We are united by confederacy, by faith, by neighborhood, by fellowship in our sufferings as exiles, and by other Christian bonds, and we hope neither Satan nor any of his instruments shall by these or any other errors disunite us, and that we shall never have cause to repent us of our so near conjunction with you, but that we shall both so equally and zealously uphold all the truths of God revealed that we may render a comfortable account to him that hath set us in our places and betruſted us with the keeping of both tables."

Supposing the Massachusetts Court to have been correct in their apprehension of the will of God and the duties of magistrates, and in regarding the Baptists as instruments of Satan to disunite the colonies bound together by such tender ties, nothing could be more reasonable than the request or demand for the rigorous suppression of these innovators. The chief disturber of the Seekonk (Rehoboth) community was Obadiah Holmes, whom we shall meet later among the sufferers for conscience' sake. After a profound religious experience in England (he had been a wayward son, and whereas three of his brothers had been educated at Oxford he had refused to avail himself of the opportunity to secure a liberal education and had derided religion), he came to New England in 1638. He united with the Salem church, where he remained about seven years. Becoming dissatisfied there, he removed to Rehoboth in 1645, where he united with the church under the ministry of Samuel Newman. In 1649, having become convinced, along with some others, that infant baptism was not in accord with the teachings of Scripture, they were immersed by John Clarke of Newport. He was soon afterward excommunicated by his pastor, and in June, 1650, along with two others, was presented to the General Court

at Plymouth, four petitions, one from the Boston Court, having been entered against them. In October, 1652, the following "Presentment by the Grand Inquest" was inserted in the Plymouth records: "We whose names are here written, being the grand inquest, do present to this Court John Hazell, Mr. Edward Smith and his wife, Obadiah Holmes, Joseph Tory and his wife, and the wife of James Mann, William Deuell and his wife, of the town of Rehoboth, for the continuing of a meeting upon the Lord's Day from house to house, contrary to the order of this Court, enacted June 12, 1650." It would seem from this record and the fact that no sentence appears against them, that the Plymouth authorities still retained a considerable measure of the Christian moderation of the father of the Pilgrims and fell very far short of what the Massachusetts Bay authorities expected and required of them.

The supposition of Baptist writers has been that the Baptists who for months held regular meetings at Rehoboth under the leadership of Obadiah Holmes did not constitute a Baptist church. There seems to be no sufficient reason why they should not be regarded as a church. Like the body of believers who gathered around Roger Williams at Providence, and who continued for many years to meet from house to house, they had a very simple organization. If we call the meeting a church we may date the organization of the first Baptist church in Massachusetts in 1649. Soon after the presentment of the grand inquest the Baptists of Rehoboth seem to have removed to Newport, where they added greatly to the strength of John Clarke's church. Thus the day for organized Baptist work in Massachusetts was postponed.

In his "Brief Narration," published in London, 1646, Winslow, writing with a view to vindicating the New England authorities from aspersions current in England, in-

volving charges of persecution of dissent, etc., gives the following interesting bit of information: "Furthermore, in the Government of Plymouth, to our great grief, not only the pastor of a congregation waiveth the administration of baptism to infants, but divers of his congregation are fallen with him; and yet all the means the civil power hath taken against him and them is to stir up our elders to give meeting, and see if by godly conference they may be able to convince and reclaim him, as in mercy once before they had done, by God's blessing upon their labors. Only at the foresaid Synod two were ordered to write to him in the name of the Assembly, and to request his presence at their next meeting aforesaid, to hold forth his light he goeth by in waiving the practice of the churches; with promise, if it be light, to walk by it; but if it appear otherwise, then they trust he will return again to the unity of practice with them." The pastor referred to is commonly understood to be Charles Chauncy, and the congregation that of Scituate. Some have supposed that Winslow was in error in making this statement, as at a later date nothing is said about Chauncy's antipedobaptism, although for a long time after this date he continued to insist on immersion as the act of baptism. But it seems incredible that Winslow, who had been governor of the colony (1633 onward) and had all along occupied a prominent position in the civil and religious administration, should have given publicity to so grave a charge as that involved in the statement quoted without the most convincing proof of the accuracy of his facts. His account, moreover, is too circumstantial to admit of the possibility of mistake. We are justified, therefore, in concluding that about 1646 Chauncy, afterward president of Harvard College, waived the administration of baptism to infants, and in this matter had the full sympathy of a portion of the Scituate church.

From the fact that he ceased to give trouble in this matter, it would seem that he yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon him by the authorities. His insistence on immersion as the only proper baptism was no doubt regarded by the authorities as more venial, and in this he was tolerated. But when, as we shall see in the next chapter, he had an opportunity to succeed Henry Dunster, who had been removed from the presidency of Harvard College for his aggressive maintenance of antipedobaptist views, he was able to abandon or hold in abeyance even this poor remnant of his Baptist teaching.

The treatment of John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes, and John Crandall, members of the Newport Baptist church, by the Massachusetts authorities is one of the most notorious instances of intolerance toward Baptists. In his "Ill News from New England," already referred to, Clarke gives a full and graphic account of the transaction, including the legal warrants, sentences, etc., his own letters to the authorities, and Holmes's very realistic account of his sufferings and religious experiences. The accuracy of Clarke's narrative has never been called in question, and is in agreement with the records of the court and other notices in the writings of the opponents of the Baptists. Clarke's account is headed: "A Faithful and True Relation of the Prosecution of Obadiah Holmes, John Crandall, and John Clarke, merely for Conscience towards God, by the Principal Members of the Church, or Common-wealth of the Massachusetts . . . ; whereby is shown their discourteous Entertainment of Strangers, and how that Spirit by which they are led would order the whole World, if either brought under them, or should come in unto them: Drawn forth by the aforesaid John Clarke, not so much to answer the Importunity of Friends, as to stop the mouths and slanderous reports of such as are Enemies to the Cross

of Christ. Let him that readeth it consider, which Church is most like the Church of Christ (that Prince of Peace, that meek and gentle Lamb, that came into this World to save Men's lives, not to destroy them), the Persecuted, or Persecuting."

It will be possible to give here only a brief *résumé* of this interesting episode. The three brethren named, as representatives of the Newport church, had made the toilsome journey to Lynn, Mass., at the request of the aged and blind William Witter, whom we have met repeatedly as a pronounced antipedobaptist. It is likely that Witter's request was not simply on his own behalf, but on behalf of a number of his neighbors who had adopted Baptist views and who were desirous of being baptized and partaking of the Supper according to the Baptist way. The authorities suspected, but were not in a position to prove, that baptism had been administered to one or more. This was neither admitted nor denied by the accused. As they were quietly worshiping on the Lord's Day at Witter's house, two miles from town, two constables arrived with a warrant for the arrest of "certain erroneous persons, being strangers." They interrupted the service and insisted on carrying the three strangers at once "to the Ale-house or Ordinary." After dinner one of the constables insisted on "carrying" them to church. They agreed to go on the distinct understanding that they would declare their dissent both by word and gesture, and would hold no communion with the church. Refusing to bare their heads, the pastor bade the constable pluck their hats off. Clarke attempted to explain the ground on which he had refused to show respect to the worship of the church or to hold communion therewith, but was refused a hearing. To the offense of holding an unlawful meeting was thus added that of disturbing public worship and denouncing

the church as not according to "the order of our Lord." These transactions occurred on July 22, 1651.

A few days later they were tried and sentenced, "without producing either accuser, witness, jury, law of God or man." "In our examination the Governor upbraided us with the name of Anabaptists; To whom I answered, I disown the name, I am neither an Anabaptist, nor a Pedobaptist, nor a Catabaptist; he told me in haste I was all; I told him he could not prove us to be either of them; he said, yes, you have Re-baptized; I denied it, saying, I have Baptized many, but I never Re-baptized any; then said he, you deny the former Baptism, and make all our worship a nullity; I told him he said it; moreover I said unto them (for therefore do I conceive I was brought before them to be a testimony against them), If the Testimony which I hold forth be true, and according to the mind of God, which I undoubtedly affirm it is, then it concerns you to look to your standing. The like to this affirmed the other two."

On the ground of the original charges and the statements made by the accused in the examination, which are enumerated in the sentence, Clarke was fined "20 pounds to be paid, or sufficient sureties that the said sum shall be paid by the first day of the next Court of Assistants, or else to be well whipt, and that you shall remain in prison till it be paid, or security given in for it." Holmes, doubtless on the ground that he was an old offender in the Plymouth colony, was fined "30 pounds or to be well whipt; and the sentence of John Crandall was to pay 5 pounds, or be well whipt."

When Clarke remonstrated against the sentence, for which no legal authority had been exhibited, Governor Endicott "stept up, and told us we had denied Infants' Baptism, and being somewhat transported broke forth,

and told me I had deserved death, and said, he would not have such trash brought into their jurisdiction; moreover he said, you go up and down, and secretly insinuate into those that are weak, but you cannot maintain it before our Ministers; you may try, and discourse or dispute with them, etc."

Availing himself of this somewhat informal and rash proposal, Clarke wrote a letter to the governor asking for the opportunity of disputing in public "with freedom, and without molestation of the civil power," "that point . . . where I doubt not by the strength of Christ to make it good out of his last Will and Testament, unto which nothing is to be added, nor from which nothing is to be diminished." The governor insisted that Clarke had misunderstood him in thinking that he promised a public disputation, and the ministers no doubt heartily disapproved of giving such an opportunity to so erroneous a person to disseminate his views. Clarke made full preparation for the disputation, with the understanding that it would be public. The theses which he undertook to defend included (1) the sole Lordship of Christ in matters of faith; (2) the testimony "that baptism, or dipping in water, is one of the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that a visible believer, or disciple of Christ Jesus, . . . is the only person that is to be baptized, or dipped with that visible baptism, or dipping of Jesus Christ in water, and also that visible person that is to walk in that visible order of his house, and so to wait for his coming a second time in the form of a Lord and King, with his glorious Kingdom according to promise"; (3) the liberty and duty of every believer "to improve that talent his Lord hath given unto him, and in the congregation may either ask for information for himself, or, if he can, may speak by way of prophecy for the edification, exhortation, and comfort of

the whole, and out of the congregation at all times, upon all occasions and in all places, as far as the jurisdiction of his Lord extends"; and (4) a testimony in favor of liberty of conscience, which, with his arguments in favor of it, has been set forth in an earlier chapter.

A friend having paid the fine, the authorities insisted on his leaving without having an opportunity to set forth his views in a disputation with a representative of the standing order. He protested ineffectually against this course, and he afterward made this refusal of a public disputation a ground for publishing in England his argument in full, along with a full account of the whole transaction.

Crandall's fine was paid, but Holmes refused on principle to allow his to be paid, and suffered in martyr fashion the alternative penalty of whipping. He wrote a detailed account of his sufferings to John Spilsbury, the first Particular Baptist minister in England, and William Kiffin, one of the earliest and most prominent.¹ For showing sympathy with Holmes on the occasion of his punishment John Spur and John Hazell were arrested and fined, with the alternative penalty of whipping. Their fines were paid without their consent. Spur testified that in a sermon, preached immediately before the sentence on Clarke, Holmes, and Crandall was pronounced, John Cotton "affirmed that denying infants' baptism would overthrow all; and this was a capital offense; and therefore they were soul murderers."

¹ The letter is embodied in Clarke's work, and has been copied, along with most of the documents of "Ill News," by Backus, vol. i., pp. 187 *seq.*

CHAPTER V.

PRESIDENT HENRY DUNSTER AND THE BAPTISTS.¹

HENRY DUNSTER ranks along with Roger Williams and John Clarke as one of the three foremost seventeenth-century antipedobaptists of America. Born in Lancashire, England, somewhere about 1610, he was early brought to an experimental knowledge of the truth. In giving an account of his early religious experience he said: "The Lord gave me an attentive ear and heart to understand preaching. . . . The Lord showed me my sins and reconciliation by Christ, . . . and this word was more sweet to me than anything else in the world." His highly sensitive conscience detected grave faults in his early manhood experience. After he had become a highly developed Christian, and one of the ablest theologians of his time, in reviewing his experience as a young man he pronounced this judgment: "The greatest thing which separated my soul from God was an inordinate desire of human learning." His course at the University of Cambridge brought him into contact with some of the best religious life in England, and when he was graduated B.A. in 1630 and M.A. in 1634, his Christian character seems to have been quite as marked as his learning. Referring to his university course he said: "After this I went to Cambridge, when, growing more careless, I lost my comfort. But I

¹ Cf. Chaplin, Backus, Mather, Winthrop, Quincy ("Hist. Harv. Univ."), Ellis, Hubbard, Palfrey.

came to Trinity to hear Dr. Preston, by whom I was quickened and revived." Preston was one of the leading Puritan churchmen of the time. Dunster regarded the teachings of Thomas Goodwin, "in many respects the greatest divine among them all," as one of the formative influences in his life. The years intervening between the date of his first degree and that of his second were probably spent chiefly in theological studies. His well-known proficiency in oriental languages was one of the acquisitions of this time. Among his contemporaries were a number of men who were to attain to world-wide distinction. It will suffice to mention the names of Cudworth, Milton, Henry More, Jeremy Taylor, and John Harvard. He probably received ordination as a minister of the Church of England. His Confession of Faith gives some intimations of the exercises of mind that led him to abandon the ministry of the Established Church and to seek a greater measure of soul freedom in New England: "The Lord hath made me bid adieu to all worldly treasures; and as corruptions in the Church came, first I began to suspect them, then to hate them." "So, after ten years' trouble, I came hither [to New England]; and the Lord gives me peace to see the order of his people." His thoroughgoing separatism finds expression in a letter written to a friend in England: "It's a glorious church, say you? Whence, I pray you, was it gathered, out of the Church of Rome, or else yet it stands in it? If it stand yet in it, then it is one of the daughters of the great whore. . . . No, the Church of England is gathered out of Rome. Come out of her, my people. . . . But why should we gather a church out of the English Church? I pray you, Sir, where hath Christ constituted a church of that form? Where's the national ministry, temple, etc.? If you will find this, you have the verity, we the vanity. If congregations be the visible churches of Christ, we have

the day in that respect." Equally decided was his antagonism to Scottish Presbyterianism. "A reformation of the Scottish edition," he thought, would leave the English people "in great distress, inward and outward." This was written when the Scotch were struggling with might and main for the civil and religious mastery of Britain, and were proposing to force Presbyterianism on the entire population. "National and provincial churches are nullities *in rerum natura* [in the nature of things] since the dissolution of that of the Jews." That he was a somewhat advanced republican is evident from the following: "If the people and nation be free from monarchy, the question is, what form they should set up? And what, I pray you, but that which is most suitable to the matter? I say, the form which is most suitable to the matter; which the nation itself, by their faithful representatives, being pious and prudent men, can best judge of."

Dunster reached New England toward the latter end of summer, 1640. He soon purchased a property in Boston, "then rather a village than a town," yet full of enterprise and growing rapidly. The entire population of New England at this time probably did not reach twenty thousand. More than two thirds of these were in Massachusetts, and something over two thousand each in Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven. In 1643 all the British colonies, except Rhode Island and Providence, formed a sort of federation "for mutual help and strength," under the style of "The United Colonies of New England." Thus Dunster arrived at a time when colonial affairs were already well advanced, and when, owing to the troubles that were about to overwhelm England, New England would be sure to receive a large influx of population, and, what was possibly of even greater importance in the eyes of the colonists, immunity from interference on the part of the

home government. One of the most noteworthy features of early colonial life was the almost entire absence of lawyers. The irregularity of court procedures, and the tendency to follow the Mosaic code rather than the English statutes, may be attributed in part to this fact; though it must be said, on the other hand, that the deficiency of lawyers was due to lack of encouragement, and that this was due in turn to the theocratic sentiments of the colonists.

A very large proportion of the early New England colonists were university graduates. By 1640 it is estimated that there were forty to fifty Cambridge men, and "the sons of Oxford were not few." There must have been something highly congenial to the intellectual and devout Dunster in his New England environment. Scarcely had he settled in his new home in Boston when he received an enthusiastic call to the presidency of the college at Cambridge (August, 1640). His qualifications for the position were recognized as extraordinary, and his coming just when needed was regarded by his contemporaries as providential. "Mr. Henry Dunster is now President of this College," wrote Captain Johnson in his "Wonder-Working Providence," "fitted from the Lord for the work, and, by those that have skill that way, reported to be an able Proficient in both Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages, an Orthodox Preacher of the truths of Christ, very powerful through his blessing to move the affections. But seeing the Lord hath been pleased to raise up so worthy an instrument for their good, he shall not want for encouragement to go on with the work, so far as a rustical rhyme shall reach." We will not quote his rhyme, which repeats the recognition of providential dealing in the matter, and intimates that already young men were coming from England to enjoy the advantages of the new college, so that

New England was repaying England for the borrowed Dunster. In "New England's First Fruits," published in London in an early year of Dunster's presidency (1643), it is said: "Over the College is Master Henry Dunster placed as President; a learned, considerable, and industrious man, who hath so trained up his pupils in the tongues and arts, and so seasoned them with the principles of Divinity and Christianity, that we have, to our great comfort, and in truth beyond our hopes, beheld their progress in learning and godliness also."

The college was only a school when Dunster assumed the headship in 1640, and for two years past it had been in charge of an incapable man, who had been dismissed for unworthy conduct. Dunster was really the first president of the college, properly so called, and the fourteen years of consecrated toil that he gave it brought it into a position exceeding the hopes of its best friends. Its resources were, as may be supposed, exceedingly scanty, its staff was small, its buildings inadequate, its library meager; but with an enthusiastic head like Dunster, ready to sacrifice means and health for the furtherance of its interests, its students had advantages such as are sometimes wanting in the most amply endowed and equipped universities. "He united in himself," says Quincy, a president and historian of the college, "the character of both patron and President; for, poor as he was, he contributed, at a time of its utmost need, one hundred acres of land toward its support; besides rendering to it, for a succession of years, a series of official services, well directed, unwearyed, and altogether inestimable."

He united with the Cambridge church, of which Mr. Shepard was pastor. In giving an account of his religious experience and doctrinal views he differed in one point only from his New England brethren, namely, in his pref-

erence for immersion as the act of baptism; yet, as "there is something for sprinkling in the Scriptures, he should not be offended when it was used."

He married, in 1641, the widow of a minister who had died on his way from England. He was a true father to her five children, who proved to be possessed of more than average gifts and graces. Two of the daughters married sons of Governor Winthrop, and it is to this circumstance that we owe the preservation of important documentary material on Dunster's life that would otherwise, in all probability, have been lost. Left a widower in 1643, he was married again in 1644. Of this marriage five children were born. Representatives of the family still remain.

Early in his New England career, Dunster began to manifest a profound interest in the Indians. John Eliot had his heartiest coöperation. Lechford, Boston's one lawyer (in his "Plain Dealing," etc.), gives us an early account of Dunster's views of Indian evangelization: "Master Henry Dunster, schoolmaster at Cambridge, deserves commendations above many; he hath the platform and the way of conversion of the natives indifferent right, and much studies the same, wherein yet he wants not opposition, as some others also have met with. He will without doubt prove an instrument of much good in the country, being a good scholar, and having skill in the tongues. He will make it good that the way to instruct the Indians must be in their own language, not English, and that their language may be perfected." It was probably at his suggestion that the commissioners of the colonies made provision for the education at Cambridge of young men "to be helpful in teaching such Indian children as should be taken into the College for that end." It was on his recommendation that the second charter of the

college (1650) stated the object of the college to be "the education of the English and Indian youth of this country in knowledge and godliness." The building called the "Indian College," though not erected until years after the close of his presidency, may have been in part a result of Dunster's profound interest in the spiritual welfare of the aborigines.

The following sentences from a letter to Ravius, a distinguished European orientalist of the time, will illustrate Dunster's enthusiasm for oriental studies and his success in imparting his enthusiasm to his students: "If God's providence put an opportunity into your hand that you help us with books of those languages from some able hands and willing hearts, . . . then should we be very glad and evermore thankful to you and them who shall procure us Buxtorf's Concordances and Bible (for the King of Spain's we have, and the King of France's Bible is more than we dare hope for) and whatsoever Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, or Arabic authors God's providence shall enlarge their hands and hearts to procure us. A wonderful impulse unto these studies lies on the spirits of our students, some of whom can with ease dexterously translate Hebrew and Chaldee into Greek."

It is not in accordance with the purpose of this chapter to give a detailed account of the labors of President Dunster in and for Harvard College, or the personal sacrifices that he made in order that the work might go prosperously on. His multifarious duties, as teacher of many subjects, as the executive head of the institution, as financial agent, etc., were familiar to most college presidents a generation ago, and are the portion of many a noble worker to-day. But he loved his work and bore his hardships with rare cheerfulness, and thereby commended himself and his college to all who had the interests of

the institution and of the cause of Christian education at heart.

But the time was coming when for conscience' sake he must lay down the work to which he had given the strength of his manhood and which was dearer to him than life itself, and when those who had gloried in his successful work could see no other course open to them than to dispense with his invaluable services. Some time between 1648 and 1653 President Dunster had reached the settled conviction that "visible believers only should be baptized." It is probable that for some years he had entertained doubts as to the propriety of infant baptism before the conviction of its unscriptural and antiscritptural character so mastered him that he could no longer keep silent. The responsibility that attached to the high and honorable position that he occupied, and the foreseen consequences to himself (which he said was the least important consideration) and to his family, which he could not but shrink from, must have availed with a man of his discretion to prevent him from rashly committing himself to views which his brethren were sure to look upon with amazement and horror. The determination of anything like the exact date of his change of view is rendered impossible by what seem to be conflicting data. Cotton Mather places the defection of Dunster "presently" after the settlement of Mitchell as pastor of the Cambridge church. The occasion of his declaration of his views was the birth of a child which he withheld from baptism. As Mitchell became pastor in 1650, and as a child was born to the Dunsters during that year, it would seem to follow that Dunster's change of view with reference to the subjects of baptism occurred some time before. But a letter of Dunster's has been brought to light which bears internal evidence of having been written about December,

1651. In answer to the question of an English correspondent: "What do you do with them that are baptized, but give no satisfactory testimony of piety when they come to age?" he answered: "None of their children are baptized until one of the parents at least do approve themselves faithful and be joined to the church. I have herewith sent you Mr. Davenport's catechism, where the question is handled, and answered according to practice." This statement has been supposed (Chaplin, 109) to prove that Dunster held to infant baptism as late as December, 1651. But as he was professedly giving information as to the New England practice rather than communicating his own individual views, there is no apparent reason why he should not, though at the time an anti-pedobaptist, have expressed himself as he did. But it is, on the whole, more probable that Mather was somewhat inaccurate in dating Dunster's protest against infant baptism "presently" after the beginning of Mitchell's pastorate, and that the infant withheld from baptism was one born in 1653. In that case it is probable that the infant born in 1650 was duly baptized, and it would follow that Dunster's convictions had not at that time become overmastering.

It is highly probable that the persecution of Clarke, Holmes, and Crandall, in the summer of 1651, had the effect of awakening Dunster's conscience on the matter of infant baptism. He may have become intellectually convinced some time before that the practice is without Scriptural warrant. The suffering of these men for what he recognized as the truth may have so impressed the matter upon his heart and conscience that he could no longer as an honest man withhold the expression of his views, or when occasion should arise refrain from acting upon them. Cotton Mather's account of the declaration of Dun-

ster against infant baptism, and of the efforts made to win him from the error of his ways, is so graphic and full, and so well illustrates the personal power of Dunster and the high consideration in which he was held, as well as the consternation into which his pastor and other leading ministers and laymen were thrown by Dunster's adoption of "Anabaptist" views, that it seems advisable to quote a portion of it: "Our Mitchell, presently upon his becoming pastor of Cambridge, met with a more than ordinary trial, in that the good man who was then President of the College was unaccountably fallen into the briars of Antipedobaptism; and being briar'd in the scruples of that persuasion, he not only forbore to present an infant of his own unto the Baptism of our Lord, but also thought himself under some obligation to bear his testimony in some sermons against the administration of baptism to any infant whatsoever. The brethren of the Church were somewhat vehement and violent in their signifying of their dissatisfaction at the obstruction, which the renitencies of that gentleman threatened with the peaceable practice of infant baptism, wherein they had hitherto walked; and judged it necessary for the vindication of the Church's name abroad in the country, and for the safety of the Congregation at home, to desire him that he would cease preaching as formerly, until he had better satisfied himself in the point now doubted by him. At these things extreme was the uneasiness of our Mitchell, who told the brethren that more light and less heat would do better; but yet saw the zeal of some against this good man's error, to push the matter on so far, that being but a young man, he was likely now to be embarrassed in a controversy with so considerable a person, and with one who had been his tutor, and a worthy and godly man. He could give this account of it: 'Through the Church's

being apt to hurry on too fast and too impatiently, I found myself much oppressed; especially considering my own weakness to grapple with these difficulties; this business did lie down and rise up, sleep and wake with me. It was a dismal thing to me, that I should live to see truth or peace dying or decaying in poor Cambridge.' But while he was, with a prudence incomparably beyond what might have been expected from a young man, managing this thorny business, he saw cause to record a passage which perhaps will be judged worthy of some remembrance. 'That day,' writes he, (Decemb. 24, 1653,) 'after I came from him, I had a strange experience; I found hurrying and pressing suggestions against Pedobaptism, and injected scruples and thoughts whether the other way might not be right, and infant baptism an invention of men; and whether I might with a good conscience baptise children, and the like. And these thoughts were darted in with some impression, and left a strange confusion and sickness upon my spirit. Yet, methought, it was not hard to discern, that they were from the EVIL ONE. First, Because they were rather injected hurrying suggestions, than any deliberate thoughts, or bringing any light with them. Secondly, Because they were unseasonable; interrupting me in my study for the Sabbath, and putting my spirit into a confusion, so as I had much ado to do aught in my sermon. It was not now a time to study that matter; but when, in the former part of the week, I had given myself to that study, the more I studied it, the more clear and rational light I saw for Pedobaptism. But now these suggestions hurried me into scruples. But they made me cry out to God for his help; and he did afterward calm and clear up my spirit. I thought the end of them was, First, to show me the corruption of my mind; how apt that was to take in error, even as my heart is to take in

lust. Secondly, to make me walk in fear and take hold on Jesus Christ to keep me in the truth; and it was a check to my former self-confidence, and it made me fearful to go needlessly to Mr. D., for methought I found a venom and poison in his insinuations and discourses against Pedobaptism. Thirdly, that I might be mindful of the aptness in others to be soon shaken in mind, and that I might warn others thereof, and might know how to speak to them from experience. And indeed my former experience of irreligious injection was some help to me to discover the nature of these. I resolved also on Mr. Hooker's principle, that I would have an argument able to remove a mountain, before I would recede from, or appear against, a truth or practice, received among the faithful. After the Sabbath was over, and I had time to reflect upon the thoughts of those things, those thoughts of doubt departed, and I returned unto my former frame.' The troubles thus impending over the Church of Cambridge, did Mr. Mitchell happily wade through; partly by much prayer with fasting, in secret, before God, for the good issue of these things; partly by getting as much help as he could from the Neighboring Ministers, to be interposed in these difficulties; and partly by using much meekness and wisdom towards the erroneous gentleman; for whom our Mr. Mitchell continued such an esteem, that although his removal from the government of the College, and from his dwelling-place in Cambridge, had been procured by these differences, yet when he died, he honored him with an elegy."

The elegiac stanzas, which Mather quotes, though not meritorious from an artistic point of view, were doubtless well intended; but Mitchell's tribute to Dunster's holiness seems slightly inconsistent with the grounds on which he persuaded himself that his conscientious scruples against

infant baptism were injections of the Evil One, and that there was a venom and poison in Dunster's antipedobaptist teachings. Mather was of the opinion "that there was a special design of Heaven in ordering these trials to befall our Mitchell, thus in the beginning of his ministry. He was hereby put upon studying and maintaining the doctrine of infant baptism. . . . In the defense of this comfortable truth, he not only preached more than half a score ungainsayable sermons, while his own Church was in some danger by the hydrophobia of anabaptism, which was come upon the mind of an eminent person in it; but also when afterwards the rest of the Churches were troubled by a strong attempt upon them from the spirit of anabaptism, there was a public disputation appointed at Boston two days together, for the clearing of the faith in this article, this worthy man was he who did most service in this disputation." No right-thinking person can fail to sympathize with the brilliant and amiable young pastor in his trying situation; and his determination "to have an argument able to remove a mountain" before he should "recede from, or appear against, a truth or practice, received among the faithful," represents the spirit of conservatism in all ages and in all denominations.

As might have been expected, the magistrates (assistants) could not long avoid taking cognizance of the fact that the president of the college had turned antipedobaptist. About January, 1654 (N. S.), they addressed a letter to the ministers, stating that they had been informed "that Mr. Dunster, President of the College, hath by his practice and opinions against infant baptism rendered himself offensive to this government," and requesting their coöperation in measures "for the preventing or removing of that which may tend to the prejudice of the College and scandal to the country." The ministers are requested "so to

deal in this business that we may, at our next meeting, be thoroughly informed how the matter stands with him in respect of his opinions, and be thereby enabled to understand what may be expected of us." On February 2d and 3d a conference was held between President Dunster and nine of the leading ministers of the vicinity, besides two ruling elders. The president proposed his thesis in regular scholastic form in Latin: *Soli visibiliter fideles sunt baptizendi* (visible believers alone should be baptized). John Norton, one of the chief disputants, somewhat indiscreetly admitted the truth of the proposition. "We grant it, but say infants of believing parents in church state are visible believers." His proof of this statement was based upon the supposed parallelism between the Jewish church and the Christian, which Dunster of course repudiated. After the argument based on the Abrahamic covenant and the grounding of infant baptism on the rite of circumcision had been threshed out, the president assumed an aggressive attitude and advanced the following argument: "All instituted gospel worship hath some express word of Scripture. But pedobaptism hath none. *Ergo*." Norton insisted that "it hath a word by manifest consequence." Dunster demanded to have the word pointed out. It must be either in the Old Testament or the New. If in the New, it must be either "in John's baptism, or Christ's, or his disciples'." "John only baptized penitent believers confessing their sins. Then not infants. *Ergo*." When Norton denied the major premise, Dunster rejoined: "They that cannot speak are not penitent believers confessing their sins." Norton insisted that "they speak virtually. . . . We all in Adam did virtually speak a word in the covenant of works." Danforth added: "So may we be baptized in our parents." Dunster insisted on personal faith. Norton conceded this point, but held that "an in-

fant makes his covenant in a public person." Dunster claimed that "there is now no public person but Christ for us to stand in." The argument from 1 Corinthians vii. 14 was adduced by Dunster's opponents and explained in a Baptist way by Dunster. The report of the discussion is evidently a very abbreviated one, little more than the heads of the arguments being given; but nothing said by the representatives of the standing order was calculated to produce the slightest impression on one who had come to see the significance and value of believers' baptism and to realize the evils of infant baptism.

In a letter written at about the time of the conference, President Dunster thus sets forth his view of the evil of infant baptism: "That way of worship which forcibly deprives the spiritual babes and converts of the church of the due consolation from Christ and dutiful obligation to Christ—that is justly suspicious. But the baptism of unregenerate infants forcibly deprives the spiritual babes and converts of the church of their due consolation from Christ, viz., the remission of sin, etc., and dutiful obligation to Christ, viz., to believe on him, die with him to sin, and rise to newness of life."

Three months after the conference, on the basis of the ministers' report, no doubt, the General Court issued the following order: "Forasmuch as it greatly concerns the welfare of this country that the youth thereof be educated not only in good literature, but sound doctrine, this Court doth therefore commend it to the serious consideration and special care of the Overseers of the College, and the selectmen of the several towns, not to admit or suffer any such to be continued in the office or place of teaching, educating, or instruction of youth or child, in the college or school, that have manifested themselves unsound in the faith, or scandalous in their lives, and not giving due sat-

isfaction according to the rules of Christ." A few weeks later (June 10, 1654) Dunster offered his resignation in the following form: "I here resign up the place wherein hitherto I have labored with all my heart (blessed be the Lord who gave it), serving you and yours. And henceforth (that you in the interim may be provided) I shall be willing to do the best I can for some weeks or months to continue the work, if the Society in the interim fall not to pieces in our hands; and what advice for the present or for the future I can give for the public good, in this behalf, with all readiness of mind I shall do it, and daily, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, pray the Lord to help and counsel us all, in whom I rest." The resignation was not accepted at once by the court, but it was left with the overseers of the college to "make provision, in case he persist in his resolution more than one month (and inform the Overseers), for some meet person to carry on and end that work for the present." There was no precipitancy on the part of the authorities, who were evidently reluctant to lose Dunster's services, and who no doubt hoped that he might at least consent to refrain from pressing his antipedobaptist views.

It is probable that Dunster might have retained his position indefinitely, even after he had fully set forth his views in the conference with the ministers, if he could have made up his mind to hold them in silence. But he was too completely mastered by his conception of the evils of infant baptism to be able, with a good conscience, to refrain from protesting against it when occasion offered. About a month after the action of the court referred to, the rite of infant baptism was being administered in the church, and he was moved in his spirit to protest against it as not according to the institution of Christ, and to answer the arguments that had just been used by the pastor

in its favor. This action of his was construed by the authorities as a violation of a law that had been enacted against disturbances of public worship. He must have known that this action would result in the severance of his relations to the college. He was soon informed that his services were no longer required, and on October 24th he offered a second and final resignation. The position was immediately offered to Charles Chauncy, who had raised considerable commotion by insisting on immersion as the act of baptism and the celebration of the Supper in the evening. In the invitation it was signified to him that it was expected and desired that he would forbear to disseminate or publish these views. His conscience was not of so firm a fiber as that of the retiring president. He was evidently eager for the presidency, and he accepted it with the conditions imposed. Dunster's petition to the court, after his final resignation, for an allowance for extraordinary services in order that he might be in a position to pay his debts, for the privilege of remaining in the house which he had "with singular industry through great difficulties erected," "until all accounts due to him from the Corporation be orderly and valuably to him your humble petitioner satisfied and paid," and for freedom "according to his education and abilities, without all impeachment, molestation, or discountenance from the authority of this colony," while "walking piously and peaceably," to "seek further and vigorously prosecute the spiritual or temporal weal of the inhabitants thereof in preaching the Gospel of Christ, teaching or training up of youth, or in any other laudable or liberal calling as God shall chalk out his way, and when, and where, and in what manner he shall find acceptance," did not receive favorable consideration.

To have allowed extraordinary compensation to a man who, by his own act, had thrown the college affairs into a

state of confusion and greatly embarrassed the authorities, especially when funds were represented by a negative rather than by a positive quantity, would have been an almost unexampled act of generosity. These extraordinary services had been fully recognized by the overseers, and had things gone on prosperously this recognition would doubtless have assumed some tangible form; but circumstances had completely changed. To grant the privilege of remaining in the house for an indefinite period would make it to his interest to delay a final settlement of the college accounts, and besides would be embarrassing to his successor. That he should be allowed to preach or teach in the colony would have been contrary to the recognized principles of the theocracy which occasioned his removal from the position that he had so ably filled. "What other laudable or liberal calling, besides preaching and education of youth, is intended, Mr. Dunster is to explain himself."

The hardship involved in Dunster's position it is difficult for us to realize. Without the sanction of the authorities there was nothing to which he could turn his hand for the maintenance of his family, except, perhaps, farming or merchandise, for neither of which he had taste or training. It is probable that his wife did not fully sympathize with him in the position he had taken. This may be inferred from the fact that his descendants in the generation following seem all to have been associated with pedobaptist churches. So reluctant was he to leave Cambridge at once that, six days after the unfavorable reply of the court to his petition, he addressed to the same body a series of considerations, wherein he pointed out the extreme inconvenience and hardship of changing his residence at that time of year and on so short notice, and the importance of his remaining to settle up the accounts of the college and to give to

his successor the information necessary for the successful performance of some of his duties. This time the court yielded, and he was permitted to remain till the following March (1655).

His trial for the disturbing of public worship did not take place till April. There is no doubt but that he had rendered himself liable to prosecution for persisting in disturbing the service; but that this matter should have been pressed at such a time, after he had suffered so greatly in being deprived of his position in the college, savors of petty persecution. Considering what the theocracy was, the relation of the college to the theocracy, and the profound dread of Anabaptism, the authorities could hardly have been expected to retain the services of a man who had assumed a hostile attitude towards what was looked upon as a fundamental doctrine. In fact, it must be admitted that the court showed considerable forbearance in not dismissing him summarily when his views had been fully ascertained; but that he should have been subjected to the indignity of a criminal process, and especially at such a time, is less excusable.

Discreditable, also, were the failure of the court to provide for the prompt payment of the forty pounds which the overseers found to be strictly due him on account, and its entire ignoring of their recommendation that one hundred pounds be allowed him for extraordinary services.

Before leaving the vicinity of Boston we find Dunster intimately associated with Thomas Gould, of Charlestown, whom we shall meet again as one of the founders of the First Baptist Church, Boston, and one of the principal sufferers for the faith in connection with this cause.

Dunster removed to Scituate, in the Plymouth colony, whence Chauncy had been called to be his successor at Cambridge. Whether Chauncy is to be credited with such

a degree of generosity as would have led him to run the risk of compromising himself with the Massachusetts authorities by using his influence in behalf of Dunster's settlement at Scituate, we do not know. The Plymouth colony, as we have seen, was far in advance of the Massachusetts Bay colony in the matter of toleration. Scituate probably excelled any other township of Plymouth in this respect. John Lathrop, who had been pastor of the Southwark (London) church founded by Henry Jacob when the first division occurred (1633), that resulted in the formation, under John Spilsbury's leadership, of the first Particular Baptist church in England, had come to New England the following year with a portion of his Independent congregation, and had settled at Scituate. These were already familiar with Baptist doctrine and were not likely to be shocked by the presentation of antipedobaptist views. Probably few other churches in New England would have so far yielded to Chauncy in the matter of immersion and the evening celebration of the Supper. It is altogether likely that Dunster found in the Scituate church a number of believers who thoroughly sympathized with his antipedobaptist views. Our information with respect to his life and labors at Scituate during the four remaining years of his career is exceedingly meager. Deane (in his "History of Scituate") finds "notices of him the same autumn employed in the ministry, in which he continued nearly five years." The probability seems to be against the supposition that he was regularly installed as pastor of the church. He had here the active sympathy and support of such noble men as Captain (afterward General) James Cudworth, who, because he dared to entertain some Quakers and to oppose their persecution, lost his position (1657) as a member of the court. Cudworth's sentiments in respect to this matter are worth quoting: "The antichristian

persecuting spirit is very active, and that in the powers of this world. He that will not lash, persecute, and punish men that differ in matters of religion, must not sit on the bench, nor sustain any office in the Commonwealth. Last election, Mr. Hatherly and myself were left off the bench, and myself discharged of my captainship, because I had entertained some of the Quakers at my house, thereby that I might be the better acquainted with their principles. I thought it better to do so than with the blind world to censure, condemn, rail at, and revile them, when they neither saw their persons nor knew any of their principles. But the Quakers and I cannot close in divers things, and so I signified to the Court; but told them withal, that as I was no Quaker, so I would be no persecutor."

In a letter written about a year before Dunster's death, Cudworth bears this testimony to his work and worth: "Through mercy we have yet among us the worthy Mr. Dunster, whom the Lord hath made boldly to bear testimony against the spirit of persecution." According to Morton ("Memorials," p. 283), Dunster "was useful to oppose their [the Quakers'] abominable opinions, and in defending the truth against them." In strongly opposing the opinions of the Quakers he was at one with Roger Williams, but we may be sure that neither of these great and good men countenanced the persecution of these religious zealots.

An incident in Dunster's later career should not be omitted. In 1656, the year after his settlement at Scituate, he received the following letter from Edward Roberts, a Welsh Baptist in government employ at Dublin: "Honored Friend: I am wholly a stranger to you further than as to report which hath spread itself to the rejoicing of many that fear the Lord, and hearing that your portion hath been to suffer in some measure for the Cross of

Christ, myself and some other that truly love you on the ground aforesaid made it our request to the truly virtuous Lord Deputy [Henry Cromwell, son of Oliver] to provide for you in this land, who readily embraced the same, and ordered fifty pounds for the bringing over yourself and family, as you may see by a copy of his Lordship's and the Council's enclosed, with directions for me to send to you, which moneys I have sent. . . . You need not fear accommodations here, though I hope that will not be your chief motive, but rather honor of the Lord and his great name. You may through mercy have free liberty of your conscience; and opportunity of associating with saints and free publishing the Gospel of Truth, which [is] greatly wanted amongst us, there being but few able and painful men who make the service of God their sake."

An earnest entreaty to confer not with flesh and blood, but "to be guided by the call of God," follows. The invitation was not accepted. For better or for worse he seems to have joined himself to New England. Doubtless he had business interests of his own and of his step-children that would have made it difficult for him to leave the country of his adoption. He may also have foreseen that the government with whose coöperation he was invited to Ireland was lacking in stability. It may be that his declining health made him reluctant to enter upon an undertaking in which much would be expected of him. Again, it may be that his wife withheld the encouragement that would have been necessary to make the change a happy one.

On the same grounds we may perhaps account for the fact that he was content to be to the end of his life a pronounced antipedobaptist in a pedobaptist church. Outside of Providence and Rhode Island there was no Baptist church in America. It is probable that up to the time of his death it would have been impossible to carry on Bap-

tist work even in the Plymouth colony. No doubt he made up his mind that, having borne his testimony and suffered his martyrdom on behalf of believers' baptism and regenerate church-membership, and finding the door absolutely closed in the colony that he had chosen as his home against the carrying on of distinctively Baptist work, his duty in respect to these doctrines would be fulfilled by a continuance of his protest and by engaging in such Christian work as was open to him. He was sowing the seed. The harvest would appear by and by.

His death occurred at Scituate, February 27, 1659. In his will, drawn up the year before, when disease had already warned him that the end was near, he made provision for his burial at Cambridge. His heart had been there during his years of absence; there he wished his mortal remains to abide. President Chauncy and Mr. Mitchell, "his reverend and trusty friends and brethren," he appointed to appraise his library, and to each he left a number of volumes. Doubtless at his funeral his brethren who had felt obliged, in the interests of the theocracy, to coöperate in securing his removal from the work in which his heart was so deeply enlisted, recalled with sadness the pathetic words contained in his statement of considerations why he should be allowed to remain in the president's residence during the winter after his resignation: "The whole transaction of this business is such which in process of time, when all things come to mature consideration, may very probably create grief on all sides; yours subsequent, as mine antecedent. I am not the man you take me to be."

Mitchell's elegiac stanzas have been already referred to. Harvard University, though she has departed greatly from the position of the Puritans and from that of Dunster, regards his memory as one of her chiefest treasures, and her historians have vied with each other in doing him honor.

CHAPTER VI.

BAPTIST CHURCHES IN MASSACHUSETTS TO 1740.¹

IF, with most writers, we leave out of consideration the Baptist meetings held by Obadiah Holmes and his fellow-believers at Rehoboth in 1649, then the first Baptist church within the territory now covered by Massachusetts was also the first Baptist church of Wales. The leader of the band of Welsh Baptists who, in 1663, took refuge in New England from persecutions under Charles II. (1662 onward) was John Myles. That they should have made their way to the Plymouth colony was natural in view of the well-known tolerant disposition of its authorities. Rehoboth, where they settled, had already, as we have seen, witnessed the holding of Baptist meetings. Like many of the ministers who sought in New England a refuge from the persecutions of the British authorities, Myles had behind him a long career of distinguished usefulness. When Obadiah Holmes was gathering the Baptist converts of Rehoboth for worship, Myles and an associate, Thomas Proud by name, were planting the Baptist banner at Ilston, Glamorganshire, Wales. Of the early life of Myles we have only meager information. Born at Newton, in Herefordshire, about 1621, we find him a student in the University of Oxford in 1636. He sprang from a region whose soil had been enriched by the blood of martyrs in

¹ Cf. Backus, Ellis, Mather, Winthrop, Morton, Hutchinson, Hubbard, Felt, Russell.

medieval and later times. It had been the stronghold of Lollardism in the fourteenth century, and it gloried in being the birthplace or the scene of the labors of such evangelical heroes and martyrs as Bradwardine, Sir John Oldcastle (Lord Cobham), and Walter Brute, in the mediæval time, and of John Penry in the age of Elizabeth. The destitution of gospel privileges in Wales about 1641 was truly appalling. Evangelical preachers had been hunted out by the Laudian inquisition, and the great majority of the ministers of the established church were ignorant and corrupt. According to Vavasour Powell, the great Baptist evangelist of Wales, "A petition was sent to the King and Parliament about 1641, setting forth humbly and truly, by many responsible persons, that after minutely searching scarcely were there found as many conscientious, settled preachers in Wales as there were counties in it." Myles began his ministry about 1645, under what circumstances or with what views of truth we are not informed.

According to the records of the Baptist church at Ilston, which Myles and his brethren brought with them to New England, the organization took place April 1, 1649. The heading of the first page is said to run: "Names of the brethren and sisters who were added to this church from the first day of the second month [April, N. S.] in 1649 to the 16th day of the same month in 1650." The name of John Myles heads the list, and is followed by that of Thomas Proud. It is probable that Myles and Proud had been baptized shortly before the inauguration of their work at Ilston into the fellowship of a London Baptist church (now meeting in the Glass House, Broad Street), whither they had apparently gone for this purpose. The London church, it is related, regarded the coming of these brethren and their proposal to enter upon evangelistic work in Wales as a direct answer to their recent prayers

for the evangelization of that region. A letter written by the pastor of the London church, dated Barnstable, May 9, 1650, is of interest in this connection: "Dear Brother Myles: Having heard lately, by some of your fellow-countrymen, and also by some of the brethren in London, of your seeking the way of the Lord in the participation of the ordinances of the Gospel in accordance with the proper mode of the Gospel, we could not less than bless the Father in your behalf, that you have fully submitted to the way of truth. Give my most fervent love to all the church." The London church long continued to regard the evangelistic work of Myles and Proud as their own, and were always ready to give the advice that the Welsh evangelists did not fail to ask of their more experienced brethren. It is probable that the evangelists received material assistance from the same source. In the Ilston church book already referred to appears "A brief report of some of the chief providences of our Father towards us, his poor and despised people, who have by great grace been baptized into the name of Jesus Christ and to the profession of the Gospel, and have united in fellowship with one another in this church." The following record will be of interest: "We cannot do less than admire the unsearchable wisdom, power, and love of God in bringing about his own purposes, which transcend the power and understanding of the wisest of men. Thus to the glory of his great name he dealt, for when there was no company or society of prophets setting forth and preaching the doctrines of worship and order and Gospel discipline, according to primitive institution, that we ever heard of since the time of the apostasy, it pleased God to choose this dark corner, to put his name in it, and to give us poor, unworthy creatures the honor of being the first in all these parts to observe the glorious ordinance of bap-

tism, and gather together the first church of baptized believers."

That the zealous laborers had much to discourage them in the early stages of the movement, and that they yet had a strong and abiding faith, is evident from the following extract from the records already quoted: "It pleased the Lord to give us some signs of his purpose to gather to himself a people to walk in fellowship with them, his servants; but in order that he might be seen more visible in his work, he began with two women, who were baptized about the beginning of the 8th month [October], 1649; and thus teaching us not to despise the day of small things, nor to judge the work of God according to appearance or human probability. For when these feeble creatures were baptized, there was not a strong probability that one more would be added to us; yet the Lord went on and called four more women before one man offered himself." But the community was ripe for such gospel efforts, and during the year following forty-six were baptized into the fellowship of the little band of believers. In eleven years the number of members had increased to two hundred and sixty-three. The labors of Myles and his associates extended over a considerable territory, and meetings must be held in several localities in order to accommodate the people. The entire church, however, were expected to meet together at Ilston on the first day of every three weeks for the breaking of bread. A number of other preachers were soon raised up in connection with the labors of Myles and Proud, and by 1651 there were four churches in fellowship.

The name of Myles appears as one of the testers (or triers) in connection with a parliamentary "Act for the Better Propagation of the Gospel in Wales," signed February 22, 1649. The aim of the act was the rooting out

of the corrupt and worthless ministers who abounded and the supplying of the principality with worthy ministers. In a few years the religious aspect of Wales had become completely changed owing to the successful working of this measure, which from a Baptist point of view was by no means an ideal arrangement, but which, on the assumption that the church endowments and rates were to be maintained and administered under the direction of the state, was a practical necessity. Myles was far from being alone among Baptist ministers in consenting to act in such capacity. Tombes, Jessey, and Dyke were among Cromwell's triers for England, and the first two at least ministered to beneficed churches.

It should be observed that Myles and Proud were by no means the first Baptists in Wales. Vavasour Powell and Cradock had been for some years evangelizing in Wales, but as they were open communionists the results of their work had appeared in mixed rather than in Baptist churches. Baptist principles flourished in Wales, and Welsh Baptists have long been noted for their consistency and devotion.

The Act of Uniformity of 1662 drove Myles from his pastorate. He is numbered among the two thousand ejected ministers, and as he had acted under the Cromwellian government in the capacity of trier for Wales, so he seems to have received support from the parish revenues that had earlier been enjoyed by the corrupt minister of the parish. We would not be understood to justify his acquiescence in this state-church arrangement; but it is desirable that we should understand the real relations of things in order that we may appreciate the situation of Myles and a number of other excellent Baptist brethren of that time. The case seems to have been something like this: the Cromwellian government had not confiscated the

church endowments or abolished the old methods of raising church revenues; the great majority of the residents in the parish where he labored desired his services in the ministry; his ministry was acceptable to the state-church authorities; as things were, the members of the parish must contribute through the legal channels, and the income from endowments, if there were any, must pass through the hands of the government authorities. Myles and his Baptist parishioners might have said, and perhaps ought to have said, "No, we will have absolutely nothing to do with a state-church arrangement; we will pay our church rates if we must; we will let the government make what use it pleases of these and of the income of the parish endowments; we will not submit to having the qualifications of our pastor passed upon by the triers appointed by the government—much less shall our pastor countenance the continuance of the state-church system by sitting on the Board of Triers; besides paying under protest what the state may exact we will, as pastor and people, pursue the New Testament plan of direct dependence on the church on the one hand, and voluntary support of the gospel ministry on the other." This would have been heroic, but the supreme importance of the voluntary system and the deadly evils of all state-churchism seem not to have impressed men like Myles, Tombes, Dyke, and Jessey, as they impressed many Baptists in the seventeenth century and as they have impressed nearly all Baptists from that time onward.

With a company of his Welsh brethren, Myles made his way to Rehoboth, as has already been stated, and was not slow in instituting Baptist worship and ordinances in his new home. With him were associated, and joined by solemn covenant, James Brown, Nicholas Tanner, Joseph Carpenter, John Butterworth, Eldad Kingsley, and Benja-

min Alby. It does not appear that any coercive measures were undertaken against the new organization until July, 1667, when Myles and Brown were arraigned before the court "for their breach of order in setting up of a public meeting without the knowledge and approbation of the Court, to the disturbance of the peace of the place," and "are fined each of them five pounds, and Mr. Tanner the sum of one pound, and we judge that their continuance at Rehoboth, being very prejudicial to the peace of that church and that town, may not be allowed; and do therefore order all persons concerned therein wholly to desist from the said meeting in that place or township, within this month. Yet in case they shall remove their meeting unto some other place, where they may not prejudice any other church, and shall give us any reasonable satisfaction respecting their principles, we do not know but they may be permitted by this government so to do."

It is evident that the Baptist work was being pushed with some vigor and had become a matter of alarm to the pastor of the church of the standing order. It is further evident that the authorities had ceased to regard antipedobaptism with the horror of the earlier time. As compared with the attitude of the Massachusetts Bay authorities before and after, the last sentence of this pronouncement is toleration itself. Massachusetts would have imprisoned and banished Myles and his associates. Plymouth simply requires them to remove to a convenient distance from the church of the standing order, so as not to disturb the peace of church and town. In October of the same year the court set apart for them a large body of land near the Rhode Island frontier, which they named Swansea, in commemoration of Swansea, near Ilston, their Welsh home. The land-grant was made in the names of Captain Willet and Mr. Paine, who were pedobaptists, and three of the

Baptist brethren. Captain Willet proposed to the other members of the new township: "1. That no erroneous person be admitted into the township either as an inhabitant or sojourner. 2. That no man of an evil behavior or contentious person, etc., be admitted. 3. That none may be admitted that may become a charge to the place." It is somewhat humiliating to Baptists to find the church under Myles consenting to these proposals, with certain explications. As it is the aim of this history to relate the facts precisely as they occurred, it may be worth while to quote the terms in which they accepted the proposal to exclude all erroneous persons: "That the first proposal relating to the non-admission of erroneous persons may be only understood under the following explications, viz.: (1) of such as hold damnable heresies, inconsistent with the faith of the gospel; as, to deny the Trinity, or any person therein; the deity or sinless humanity of Christ, or the union of both natures in him, or his full satisfaction to the divine justice of all his elect, by his active or passive obedience, or his resurrection, ascension into heaven, intercession, or his second coming personally to judgment; or else to deny the truth or divine authority of the Scriptures, or the resurrection of the dead, or to maintain any merit of works, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, giving divine adoration to any creature, or any other anti-christian doctrine directly opposing the priestly, prophetic, or kingly offices of Christ, or any part thereof; (2) or such as hold such opinions as are inconsistent with the well-being of the place, as to deny the magistrate's power to punish evil-doers as well as to encourage those that do well, or to deny the first day of the week to be observed by divine institution as the Lord's Day or Christian Sabbath, or to deny the giving of honor to whom honor is due, or to oppose those civil respects that are usually per-

formed according to the laudable customs of our nation each to other, as bowing the knee or body, etc., or else to deny the office, use, or authority of the ministry or a comfortable maintenance to be due to them from such as partake of their teachings, or to speak reproachfully of any of the churches of Christ in the country, or of any such other churches as are of the same common faith with us or them. We desire that it be also understood and declared that this is not understood of any holding any opinion different from others in any disputable point, yet in controversy among the godly learned, the belief thereof not being essentially necessary to salvation; such as pedobaptism, antipedobaptism, church discipline, or the like; but that the minister or ministers of the said town may take their liberty to baptize infants or grown persons as the Lord shall persuade their consciences, and so also the inhabitants take their liberty to bring their children to baptism or to forbear."

Here we see a result of Myles's training in connection with the state-church system of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. He had failed to grasp the great principle of absolute liberty of conscience which the mass of antipedobaptists from the Reformation time onward had consistently advocated and practiced. If this document mean anything, it means that Myles and his Baptist brethren would have coöperated with the pedobaptist inhabitants of the township of Swansea in excluding, by forcible means if necessary, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Anglicans, Arminians, Socinians of all classes, Sabbatarians, and Quakers. Roger Williams would have been almost as unacceptable in Swansea as he had been thirty years before to the Massachusetts Bay authorities, and few, if any, of the Baptists we have encountered in New England would have been able to endure the test. There

is fortunately no case on record in which the vicious principle of this document was practically applied. Doubtless contact with the disciples of Roger Williams and John Clarke in the neighboring churches of Providence and Newport taught these anomalous Baptists the way of the Lord more perfectly. It may be that anxiety to escape persecution led them to express themselves more strongly on these matters than their own best judgment would have approved or than they would have been willing to carry out in practice. But this possible explanation is as little to their credit as their failure to apprehend a fundamental principle of the denomination.

Yet, notwithstanding the defect mentioned, the Swansea church was greatly prospered, the entire community remaining Baptist until the latter part of the eighteenth century. (Backus, ii., 433.) By the middle of 1681 Myles had grown "very aged and feeble," and was "often incapable of his ministerial work." The brethren wrote an earnest plea to the Baptist ministers of London for "an able man to come over," for whom they "conceive there is a prospect of good encouragement, . . . in that there seems to be an apparent and general apostasy among the churches who have professed themselves Congregational in this land; whereby many have their eyes opened, by seeing the declension and confusion that is among them." There is reason to suspect that it was not wholly the feebleness of the pastor that led to this application. The pastor was old and feeble, certainly, but it is probable that some feeling had arisen between pastor and people. In 1682 he preached for a while in Boston, and a report gained currency that was cast into the teeth of Boston brethren by the authorities in this form: "Behold your great Doctor, Mr. Myles of Swanzey, for he now leaves his profession and is come away, and will not teach his people any more,

because he is like to perish for want, and his gathered church and people will not help him." The effort to secure a pastor in England proved a failure, and no doubt the differences between the old pastor and his flock were adjusted. He died as pastor of the church February 3, 1683, and his memory remains fragrant in the community where his labors were so fruitful. He was succeeded after a considerable interval by Samuel Luther, who had been for some time a member of the church and had represented Swansea in the colonial legislature. He was ordained to the pastorate July 22, 1685, elders from the Boston church assisting. He remained pastor till his death, in 1717. The next pastor was Ephraim Wheaton, who for thirteen years had assisted Luther in his ministerial labors. The church greatly prospered under Wheaton's ministry. During the five years beginning with 1718, fifty were received into the church, and before his death, in 1734, the membership had risen to two hundred. His successor, Samuel Maxwell, was noted for his piety and zeal, but having adopted Sabbatarian views, and being thought unsteady in other points of Baptist doctrine, he was dismissed from the church in 1739. The next pastor was popular, but proved unworthy, and the next was so unacceptable that the church greatly declined, many members withdrawing to other churches which had been organized in the neighborhood. But a bright future was before the church in the period to follow, in connection with the Great Awakening.

The new charter, under William and Mary, granted in 1691, provided for "liberty of conscience in the worship of God to all Christians, except Papists." "Liberty of conscience" was interpreted by the Massachusetts authorities in such a way as to allow of the taxation of dissenters for the support of ministers of the standing order.

In 1692 an act was passed for the support of ministers.

As revised in 1693, it provided "that each respective gathered church, in any town or place within this Province, that at any time shall be in want of a minister, such church shall have the power, according to the directions given in the Word of God, to choose their own minister"; but before the settlement could be consummated the concurrence of a majority of voters in town affairs must be secured. After such concurrence, "all the inhabitants and ratable estates lying within such town, or part of a town, or place limited by law for upholding the public worship of God, shall be obliged to pay in proportion towards the minister's settlement and support." Boston was excepted from the operation of this law, but otherwise its provisions were made compulsory by a requirement that the county courts should summon and heavily fine the selectmen or other officers of any town failing to comply. It was not long before the Bristol Court issued a warrant requiring the town of Swansea to choose a minister according to law. As the Baptist church was the only church in the town, and as a large majority of the inhabitants were Baptist in sentiment, there was no difficulty in securing for the pastor the concurrence of a majority of the voters of the town. It is humiliating to find that after a short delay the requisition was complied with, and the report was sent to the court that Samuel Luther had been chosen pastor according to law. Whether the church allowed a general assessment for the support of its pastor to be carried out we are not informed. As in the laying out of the township, which had been publicly granted to a company the majority of whom were Baptists, certain lots had been set apart for the support of public worship, it may be that a general assessment was not required.

The law referred to was in force until 1728, when an act was passed "to exempt persons commonly called Ana-

baptists, and those called Quakers, . . . from being taxed for and towards the support of " ministers. This act at first exempted from poll-taxes only, and it applied only to persons living within five miles of their meeting-place. In 1729 it was modified to include estate-taxes. The act was to be valid for five years only. At the expiration of this term its provisions were renewed, with the requirement that assessors should make lists of Anabaptists in each community and that these lists should be subject to inspection and to correction on the presentation of certificates signed by " two principal members of that persuasion." As no penalty was affixed to neglect of compliance with the law on the part of the assessors, Baptists were put to much inconvenience, annoyance, and expense in securing the exemption provided for.

The history of the First Baptist Church of Boston next demands attention. It is certain that there were a number of Baptists in the neighborhood of Boston at an early date. We have seen that in 1655 Thomas Gould, of Charlestown, had fellowship with President Dunster in antipedobaptism, and that meetings were already held at the house of the former in this interest. Such meetings were doubtless kept up with a considerable degree of regularity from that time until 1665, when (May 28) Thomas Gould, Thomas Osburne, Edward Drinker, and John George were baptized, and united with Richard Goodall, William Turner, Robert Lambert, Mary Goodall, and Mary Newel, who had been previously baptized, most or all of them in England, " in a solemn covenant, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to walk in fellowship and communion together, in the practice of all the holy appointments of Christ, which he had or should further make known to them." The Goodalls had been members of William Kiffin's church in London, Lambert and Turner of Mr. Stead's church in Dartmouth;

Gould and Osburne withdrew from the church of the standing order in Charlestown. According to a record made at the time by the Roxbury church and published in an almanac, "the Anabaptists gathered themselves into a church, prophesied one by one, and some one among them administered the Lord's Supper after he was regularly excommunicated by the church at Charlestown; they also set up a lecture at Drinker's house once a fortnight."

Much was made of the fact that the new organization admitted as members and appointed to official positions those who had been excommunicated by the churches of the standing order. The "moral scandals" of which Cotton Mather speaks as the ground for their excommunication were of no more serious nature than somewhat demonstrative protestations against the administration of infant baptism, and absenting themselves from the meetings of the church. It seems somewhat gratuitous to charge them with schismatic organization of a new church, and to seek to bring the schismatic organization into further contempt by making the incipient stages of the schism a ground for charges of immoral conduct. The officers of the Charlestown church certainly deserve credit for the patience and perseverance with which they labored with Gould. According to Willard, a contemporary opponent of the new church (Backus, i., 289): "The church in much tenderness waited upon him, and proceeded not to excommunication, but tried with admonition upon admonition, and that by the space of seven or eight years; nor was he excommunicated till (having left his own) he joined to another society, without the church's leave, or once asking it; and now also being twice sent for by the church, he disclaimed their authority over him. . . . He did (while under admonition) neglect public worship, and gather a private meeting on the Sabbath to his house. He did

wickedly slight the admonition of the church, declaring that they had, by it, discharged him of all relation to them."

Substantially the same is the charge against Osburne.

The occasion of Gould's first protest against infant baptism was the birth of a child in 1655. His own account of the matter is of interest: "It having been a long time a scruple to me about infant baptism, God was pleased at last to make it clear to me, by the rule of the gospel, that children were not capable nor fit subjects for such an ordinance, because Christ gave this commission to his apostles, first to preach to make them disciples, and then to baptize them, which infants were not capable of; so that I durst not bring forth my child to be partaker of it." The details of the ecclesiastical processes by which it was sought to win this Anabaptist heretic from the error of his way, as reported by Gould himself, are picturesque and in some cases piquant; but nothing new was added to the arguments for and against the baptism of infants. Repeated conferences led to no change of sentiment on either side. What followed these conferences may be best given in Gould's own language: "Now after this, considering with myself what the Lord would have me to do; not likely to join with any of the churches of New England any more, and so to be without the ordinances of Christ; in the mean time God sent out of Old England some who were Baptists; we, consulting together what to do, sought the Lord to direct us, and taking counsel of other friends who dwelt among us, who were able and godly, they gave us counsel to congregate ourselves together; and so we did, being nine of us, to walk in the order of the gospel according to the rule of Christ, yet knowing that it was a breach of the law of this country; that we had not the approbation of magistrates and ministers, for that we suffered the penalty of that law, when we were called before them."

Shortly after the organization of the new church, Gould was solemnly summoned to appear before the church to which he had formerly belonged on the following Lord's Day. He repudiated any right of the church to demand his presence, and declined to obey the summons. At the entreaty of some of his friends, who feared that some godly members of the church might, in case of his failure to state the grounds of his action in public assembly, ignorantly join in his excommunication and thus commit sin, he agreed to be present on a subsequent Lord's Day. The result was the excommunication of such Baptists as had been members of the church.

In September, 1665, they were arraigned before the Court of Assistants. They exhibited to the court a carefully written confession of faith. Objection was raised to the following article, on the ground that it excludes from visible saintship all unbaptized persons: "Christ's commission to his disciples is to teach and baptize, and those who gladly receive the word and are baptized are saints by calling, and fit matter for a visible church." "If any take this to be heresy," the confession concludes, "then do we, with the apostle, confess, that after the way which they call heresy, we worship God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, believing all things that are written in the law and the prophets and apostles." As the accused showed no disposition to yield to the authorities, the case was referred to the General Court to be held the next month (October 11). The sentence of the court reads as follows: "This Court, taking the premises into consideration, do judge meet to declare that the said Gould and company are no orderly church assembly, and that they stand justly convicted of high presumption against the Lord and his holy appointments, as also the peace of this government, against which this Court doth account themselves bound to God,

his truth, and his churches here planted, to bear their testimony, and do therefore sentence the said Gould, Osburne, Drinker, Turner, and George, such of them as are freemen, to be disfranchised, and all of them, upon conviction, before any one magistrate or Court, of their further proceedings herein, to be committed to prison until the General Court shall take further order with them."

It need scarcely be said that the Baptists continued their meetings. On April 17, 1666, they were summoned before the County Court at Cambridge, and Gould, Osburne, and George were fined four pounds each and required to give bond for their appearance at the next Court of Assistants in the sum of twenty pounds each. Refusing to comply with these requirements, they were cast into prison. The Court of Assistants required them to pay their fines and gave them to understand that the previous order was to "stand in full force." The fines seem to have been paid and the prisoners liberated. But annoyances of this kind continued. In March, 1668, Gould appealed from the County Court to the Court of Assistants, with the result that the jury "found for the plaintiff, reversion of the former judgment." The court refused to accept this verdict and sent the jury out for further consideration. A qualified statement was returned, on the basis of which the decision of the lower court was sustained.

In connection with these procedures the governor and council arranged for a meeting of the principal ministers along with the governor and magistrates, "before whom . . . the above-said persons and their company shall have liberty, freely and fully, in open assembly, to present their grounds . . . in an orderly debate of this following question: Whether it be justifiable by the word of God, for these persons and their company to depart from communion with these churches, and to set up an assembly here

in the way of Anabaptism, and whether such a practice is to be allowed by the government of this jurisdiction? To Thomas Gould: You are hereby required in his Majesty's name, according to the order of the Council above written, to give notice thereof to John Farnum, senior, Thomas Osburne, and the company, and you and they are alike required to give your attendance." In this disputation Gould and his associates had the active sympathy and support of the Newport church, three of whose leading members, William Hiscox, Joseph Torrey, and Samuel Hubbard, were delegated by the church to be present, and arrived three days before the event. The result was as we have learned to expect in all such cases: the party in power considered themselves victorious, and the weaker party, for refusing to see the force of the arguments of their opponents, were branded as obstinate heretics. The record reminds one strongly of the protocols of sixteenth-century Anabaptist processes in Catholic Austria or Protestant Germany: "Whereas, Thomas Gould, William Turner, and John Farnum, senior, obstinate and turbulent Anabaptists, have some time since combined themselves with others in a pretended church estate, without the knowledge and approbation of the authority here established, to the great grief and offense of the godly orthodox; . . . the said persons did in open Court assert their former practice to have been according to the mind of God, and that nothing that they had heard had convinced them to the contrary; which practice, being also otherwise circumstanced with making infant baptism a nullity, and thereby making us all to be unbaptized persons, and so consequently no regular churches, ministry, or ordinances, as also renouncing all our churches, as being so bad and corrupt that they are not fit to be held communion with; denying to submit to the government of Christ in the church, and entertaining

of those who are under church censure, thereby making the discipline of Christ to be of none effect, and manifestly tending to the disturbance and destruction of these churches,—opening the door for all sorts of abominations to come in among us, to the disturbance not only of ecclesiastical enjoyments, but also contempt of our civil order and the authority here established, . . . which duty to God and the country doth oblige us to prevent, by using the most compassionate effectual means to attain the same; all of which considering, together with the danger of disseminating their errors, and encouraging presumptuous irregularities by their example, should they continue in this jurisdiction; this Court do judge it necessary that they be removed to some other part of this country, or elsewhere, and accordingly doth order that the said Thomas Gould, William Turner, and James Farnum, senior, do, before the 20th of July next, remove themselves out of this jurisdiction.”

The sentence further provides for their imprisonment without bail or mainprise in case they should be found in the jurisdiction after the time fixed; and all officers concerned are especially ordered to see to the execution of the sentence. The church is forbidden to assemble again on any pretense whatever, and imprisonment and banishment are made the penalty of such meeting.

If we would rightly appreciate the significance of this determined effort of the Baptists to embody their views in church organization and church life, on the one hand, and the equally determined effort of the Massachusetts authorities to crush the movement in its very inception, on the other, we must call to mind the stage of British history that has been reached. Since the banishment of Roger Williams more than thirty momentous years had elapsed. The Long Parliament, the Civil War, the Commonwealth,

the Protectorate, and the Restoration had succeeded one another with startling abruptness and revolutionizing effect. The ecclesiastical tyranny of Archbishop Laud and Charles I. was succeeded by a triumph of Presbyterian Puritanism and a vigorous effort on the part of the latter to bring the whole of Britain into subjection to Presbyterian doctrine and discipline (1641-48). Independency, pedobaptist and Baptist, which in 1640 was limited to a few persecuted and despised congregations and a number of isolated individuals in the Puritan churches, had by 1647 attained to a dominating position in the triumphant parliamentary army, most of the leading officers having become Independent and many of them Baptist; and this Independent army had been able to destroy monarchy and prelacy and to put a limit to Presbyterian aspirations after theocratic control. The doctrine of liberty of conscience, which had hitherto been advocated only by a few obscure Baptists, had been set forth with magnificent completeness and telling effect by Roger Williams, and had been accepted with greater or less completeness by a large proportion, and the most influential portion, of the English people. The Restoration had brought terrible persecution to dissent from the established church, involving the ejection in 1662 of two thousand Presbyterian and Independent ministers. Even English Puritans were coming to see that something could be said in favor of toleration. We may note the earnest remonstrances from leading English Congregationalists in connection with the persecution of Clarke, Holmes, and Crandall, in 1651. The persecution of Gould and his brethren in 1668 by the New England Congregationalists was a source of amazement to English Congregationalists, who had long before learned the way of the Lord more perfectly, and who were at this very time groaning under the intolerance of the restored Stuart dynasty. The New

England theocracy had remained stationary in its intolerance, while the large party in England with whom it claimed affiliation had made great strides forward in their conception of civil and religious liberty. Wilson, the first pastor of the Boston church, made a dying declaration about this time (May, 1667), which many accepted as the words of a prophet. Among the sins which in his view greatly provoked God were: "1. Separation. 2. Anabaptism. 3. Corahism." The latter he defined as rising up against ministers or elders. All three of these specifications were aimed at the Baptists. He reproached the magistrates for being "Gallio-like, either not caring for these things, or else not using their power and authority for the maintenance of the truth, gospel, and ordinances of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "Should the Lord leave them hereunto, how miserable a people we should be!"

It should also be borne in mind that at the time of the organization of the First Baptist Church of Boston the New England churches were convulsed with controversy over the Half-way Covenant. According to the earlier arrangement, embodied in part in the Cambridge Platform of 1648, the exercise of the rights of citizenship was limited to those in full communion in one of the recognized churches, and full communion was accorded only to those who gave credible evidence of having exercised saving faith and having been regenerated by the Holy Spirit. Each individual applying for church-membership must submit to a thorough examination as to his Christian experience. Only the children of parents at least one of whom was in full communion were entitled to baptism. Baptized children were regarded as church-members by virtue of the fact that they were children of believers, but even such could become eligible to partake of the Supper

only by making a personal profession of saving faith. The result of these arrangements was that within a few years the great mass of the population were deprived of full communion and so of citizenship and of the right to have their children baptized. It began to be seriously asked by many, What is the use of infant baptism, seeing that it confers no special privilege, civil or religious, apart from the personal profession of the person baptized? Why not postpone baptism until after the personal profession? The discontent of the majority of the population at being taxed for the support of public worship and yet denied the privileges of membership for themselves and their families, and especially at being civilly disfranchised, had become so general and demonstrative by 1657 that it could no longer be safely ignored. Moreover, the tendency of the logic of the situation toward the production of Baptists had doubtless become evident to many minds. The Half-way Covenant was a measure, agreed to by a large majority of the Synod called together by the civil authorities to consider the situation, for the remedying of the difficulties that had become embarrassing. Already at the time of the adoption of the Cambridge Platform there was a large and influential party in favor of extending the privileges of baptism and making the terms of communion more liberal. The question before the Synods of 1657 and 1662 was whether to enlarge the subjects of full communion, so that those who had been baptized in infancy, were orthodox in their views and without scandal in their lives, should be received into full communion without a personal profession of saving faith; or to accord the privilege of baptism to the children of such. The decision was in favor of the latter concession, but in practice the doors of many of the churches were soon thrown wide open, and the requirement of evidences of personal regeneration was gen-

erally abandoned, its place being taken by a formal owning of the covenant. As the logic of the situation under the Cambridge Platform had favored the development of Baptist sentiment, so the virtual abandonment of the effort to maintain regenerate membership on the part of the New England churches furnished the strongest possible ground for Baptist protest, regenerate membership having been from the beginning one of the chief points of their contention. The Boston church of which Wilson had been pastor was soon to suffer schism under John Davenport, his successor, who was one of the most pronounced opponents of the Half-way Covenant; and a condition of unrest in ecclesiastical matters that was highly favorable to the formation of new churches pervaded the colonies.

But this necessary digression has already proceeded too far. We left Gould under the sentence of the court, with banishment as the only alternative to continued imprisonment, and the Baptist church forbidden to assemble further under like penalties. On July 30th, William Turner and John Farnum were likewise committed to jail. A numerous and influentially signed petition for the release of the prisoners, based on humanitarian as well as on religious grounds, was presented to the assembly at its autumn session. Governor Bellingham was one of the most intolerant of the magistrates, and was largely influential in securing these rigorous measures against the Baptists. Francis Willoughby, deputy governor, 1665-71, is said to have opposed these persecuting measures. Reports of this persecution were sent to England. The following extracts from a letter written to Captain Oliver by Robert Mascall will illustrate the feelings awakened among English nonconformists by these procedures: "We are hearty and full for our Presbyterian brethren's enjoying equal liberty with ourselves; oh that they had the same spirit

towards us! but oh, how it grieves and affects us that New England should persecute! will you not give what you take? is liberty of conscience your due? and is it not as due unto others that are sound in the faith? . . . Now must we force our interpretation upon others, Pope-like? In verse 5 of that chapter [Rom. xiv.] the Spirit of God saith, 'Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind;' therefore this being the express will of God, who shall make a contrary law, and say, Persuaded or not persuaded, you shall do as we say, and as we do! and verse 23, 'What is not of faith is sin;' therefore there must be a word for what we do, and we must see and believe it, or else we sin if we do it. . . . And what principles is persecution grounded upon? Domination and infallibility. This we teach is the truth. But are we infallible, and have we the government? God made none, no not the apostles who could not err, to be lords over faith; therefore what monstrous pride is this? At this rate any persuasion getting uppermost may command, and persecute them that obey them not; all nonconformists must be ill-used. Oh wicked and monstrous principle! . . . Whatever you can say against those poor men, your enemies say against you. And what! is that horrid principle crept into precious New England, who have felt what persecution is, and have always pleaded for liberty of conscience? Have not those [Baptists] run equal hazards with you for the enjoyment of their liberties; and how do you cast a reproach upon us, that are Congregational in England, and furnish our adversaries with weapons against us? We blush and are filled with shame and confusion of face, when we hear of these things." The following from the same letter shows how English Congregationalists had come to look upon their Baptist brethren who had fought shoulder to shoulder with them in the great conflict for civil and religious lib-

erty: "Dear brother, we here do love and honor them, hold familiarity with them, and take sweet counsel together; they lie in the bosom of Christ, and therefore ought to be laid in our bosoms. In a word, we freely admit them into churches; few of our churches but many of our members are Anabaptists; I mean baptized again. . . . Anabaptists are neither spirited nor principled to injure nor hurt your government nor your liberties; but rather these be a means to preserve your churches from apostasy, and provoke them to their primitive purity."

Thirteen leading dissenting ministers of England, including Drs. Owen and Goodwin and Messrs. Nye and Caryl, wrote to the governor of Massachusetts in a similar strain, the consideration most emphasized being the great injury that would be done to the dissenting interest in England by such intolerant practices in New England.

It was due, no doubt, to the combined influence of the strong local sentiment that had found expression in various ways, and to the vigorous protestation of the most influential Congregationalists of England, that the prisoners for conscience' sake were released in a little less than a year. It is probable that a majority of the magistrates would have yielded to the demand for release long before, but the governor was obdurate. For some years the Baptists held their services upon Noddle's Island, where Gould took up his residence. In November, 1670, we find Turner again in prison, and warrants were "in two marshals' hands for brother Gould also, but he is not yet taken, because he lives on Noddle's Island, and they only wait to take him at town." So wrote Edward Drinker, a member of the church, to John Clarke and the Newport church. From this letter it appears that earnest efforts were made to secure the release of the prisoner, and that nearly all of the deputies were against the imprisonment of the Bap-

tists: "The town and country is very much troubled at our troubles; and especially the old church in Boston, and their elders, both Mr. Oxonbridge and Mr. Allen, have labored abundantly, I think as if it had been for their best friends in the world. Many more gentlemen and solid Christians are for our brother's deliverance; but it cannot be had; a very great trouble to the town; and they had gotten six magistrates' hands for his deliverance, but could not get the Governor's hand to it. . . . We keep our meeting at Noddle's Island, every First-day, and the Lord is adding some souls to us still, and is enlightening some others; the priests are much enraged. The Lord has given us another elder, one John Russell, senior, a gracious, wise, and holy man that lives at Woburn, where we have five brethren near that can meet with him; and they meet together First-days when they cannot come to us, and I hear there are some more there looking that way with them. . . . Brother Turner's family is very weakly and himself too. I fear he will not trouble them long."

Massachusetts was far behind the times in the matter of toleration, and a commotion like that aroused by the persecution of these godly, simple people was needed to show the authorities in church and state what the world thought of that sort of thing, and to bring out into activity the sentiments against tyranny and injustice that might otherwise have remained latent. The reply from Newport written by Samuel Hubbard is full of sympathy and brotherly love. It is dated "9th month, 1671," more than nine months after the letter of Drinker. It may be that other correspondence intervened. A further letter written to Newport in reply to Hubbard's, and dated "the first, 10th month, '71," contains the following items: "Brother Turner has been near to death, but through mercy is revived, and so has our pastor, Gould. The Lord make us truly thank-

ful, and give us hearts to improve them, and those liberties we yet enjoy that we know not how soon may be taken from us. The persecuting spirit begins to stir again. Elder Russell and his son, and brother Foster, are presented to the Court that is to be this month." From a letter written by a member of the church, "14, of the 4th month, 1672," we learn that Russell is "out of prison bonds, but is in a doubtful way as to recovery of his outward health." The party addressed had heard that he had died in prison.

In 1672 a revised edition of the law-book of Massachusetts was ordered by the assembly. The views of the Baptists are therein classed with "damnable heresies" and "notorious impieties." It is "ordered and declared by the Court, that if any Christian within this jurisdiction shall go about to subvert and destroy the Christian faith and religion, by breaching and maintaining any damnable heresies; as denying the immortality of the soul, or resurrection of the body, or any sin to be repented of in the regenerate, or any evil done by the outward man to be accounted sin, or denying that Christ gave himself a ransom for our sins, or shall affirm that we are not justified by his death and righteousness, but by the perfection of our own works, or shall deny the morality of the fourth commandment, or shall openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of that ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy, or their lawful authority to make war, or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, or shall endeavor to seduce others to any of the errors and heresies above mentioned; every such person continuing obstinate therein, after due means of conviction, shall be sentenced to banishment."

Persecution was renewed in 1673. A member of the

church, writing June 19, 1673, relates: "Brother Trumbel and brother Osburne were fined last Court at Charlestown, twenty shillings apiece; they have appealed to the Court of Assistants." In his election sermon, preached May 7, 1673, Urian Oakes voiced the sentiment of the dominant party when he said: "I look upon an unbounded toleration as the first-born of all abominations. . . . The eye of the magistrate is to be to the securing of the way of God, that is duly established. . . . We must not be so compassionate to schismatic, turbulent, erroneous persons, as to be cruel, injurious, or unkind to the precious interests of Christ among us. Nature teacheth a man self-preservation. Grace should teach a Christian magistrate . . . Christ-preservation."

The death of Governor Bellingham (December, 1672) and the accession of Governor Leverett, who had long been known as a friend of the persecuted Baptists, brought them considerable relief before the close of 1673. In January, 1674, a member could write: "The church of the baptized do peaceably enjoy their liberty." The deputy governor, Mr. Symonds, was like-minded with the governor in his opposition to persecution. The death of the noble founder and first pastor of the church occurred October 27, 1675. He was a plain man, of only an ordinary education; but he seems to have been full of the Holy Ghost and of power. There is nothing on record to his disadvantage. His life was one of great suffering, but eminently fruitful.

In the great Indian war of 1676, Captain William Turner, a member of the church, with a company containing a number of Baptists, achieved one of the most important victories of the campaign and lost his own life.

Shortly after the death of Gould, John Myles gave some months of valuable service to the Boston church, without

ceasing to be pastor at Swansea. By February, 1677, the little flock had so increased in numbers that it was voted to divide the church, for the greater convenience, no doubt, of some of the members; but eleven months later this action was reconsidered, and it was decided first of all to devote their energies to the building of a meeting-house and the settlement of an efficient minister. Of their own number Russell was thought to be best qualified for the pastorate. The question of retaining the services of Myles and of sending Russell in his place to Swansea was considered; but four parties would have been involved in such a transaction—namely, Myles, Russell, the Swansea church, and the Boston church—and to secure the concurrence of all would in any case have been a difficult undertaking. Myles returned to Swansea, and in July, 1679, Russell was ordained pastor of the church.

Bradstreet, the successor of Governor Leverett, favored the rigorous execution of the law against antipedobaptists, and we learn from a letter to the Newport church dated January 25, 1679, that members of the church had been called to court, censured, heavily fined, and compelled to pay court costs, while others had been only admonished and condemned to pay costs. It is stated that the constables were backward to distress them for the charges.

By February 9th, Philip Squire and Ellis Callender had quietly erected a plain meeting-house in Boston, for which the church paid them sixty pounds. When it became known that the new building was to be used as a Baptist meeting-house, the theocratic authorities were filled with indignation and alarm. The Baptist leaders were arraigned before the court, and as such audacity as was involved in the erection of a Baptist house of worship had scarcely occurred to the authorities as possible, it was found that no law existed against such an act. But the Massachusetts

Court could enact laws as well as execute them. It was ordered "that no persons whatever, without the consent of the freemen of the town where they live, . . . or, in defect of such consent, a license by the special order of the General Court, shall erect or make use of any house as above said; and in case any person or persons shall be convicted of transgressing this law, every such house or houses wherein such persons shall so meet, more than three, with the land whereon such house or houses stand, and all private ways leading thereto, shall be forfeited to the use of the county."

In July following, Charles II., persecutor though he was, wrote to the Massachusetts authorities, requiring them to allow liberty of conscience to all Protestants, and especially insisting that no good subjects of his, for not agreeing in the Congregational way, should "be subjected to fines or forfeitures, or other incapacities for the same; which is a severity to be the more wondered at, whereas liberty of conscience was made a principal motive for your first transportation into those parts." But even if the magistrates had been disposed to yield to the wishes of the king in the matter of toleration, they might have been thwarted by the overwhelming influence of the ministers. In this same year the Reforming Synod was called for ascertaining: "1st. What are the evils that have provoked the Lord to bring his judgments on New England? 2d. What is to be done that so these evils may be reformed?" In the diagnosis, under the third specification, the following occurs: "Human inventions and will-worship have been set up even in Jerusalem. Men have set up their thresholds by God's threshold, and their posts by his post. Quakers are false worshipers: and such Anabaptists as have risen up amongst us, in opposition to the churches of the Lord Jesus, receiving into their society those that

have been for scandal delivered unto Satan, yea, and improving those as administrators of holy things, who have been (as doth appear) justly under church censures, do no better than to set up an altar against the Lord's altar. Wherefore it must needs be provoking to God, if these things be not duly and fully testified against, by every one in their several capacities respectively." The Old Testament references following make it evident that the capacity in which magistrates are to testify is the use of force for the extirpation of heresy. Such men as Increase Mather seem to have honestly believed that one of the reasons for the terrible destruction of life and property by the Indians from 1676 onward was the failure of the New England people to exterminate Quakerism and antipedobaptism. It is scarcely needful to say that the "scandal" and "church censures" mentioned in the document quoted were solely in connection with protests against infant baptism.

It is not to be wondered at that the authorities should have disregarded the king's command, and that they should have heeded the requirement of the ministers in solemn Synod assembled to testify "duly and fully" against "the Anabaptists." A warrant was issued for March 5, 1680, "in his Majesty's name, forthwith to summon Philip Squire, Thomas Skinner, and Mr. Drinker, to make their appearance before the Court of Assistants now sitting, . . . to give an account of their breach of the law in erecting a meeting-house." It will be remembered that the law referred to was enacted after the offense had been committed; and to issue a warrant in his Majesty's name in opposition to his Majesty's express command seems a little like taking his Majesty's name in vain. The church presented to the court a dignified and Christian "petition and declaration," in which they set forth the innocence of their motives in separating and in building a meeting-house,

and as "having no design against the peace of the place, but being still as ready as ever to hazard" their "lives for the defense of the people of God here," they "do humbly request" that they may be permitted "to enjoy the liberty of God's worship, in such places as God has afforded" them. "There being a law made in May last against meeting in the place built, we submitted to the same, until we fully understood, by letters from several in London, that it was his Majesty's pleasure and command . . . that we should enjoy liberty of our meetings in the manner as other of his Protestant subjects; and the General Court at their last meeting not having voted a non-concurrence."

The court responded by ordering the doors of the house to be shut, and inhibiting the holding of meetings or the opening of the doors. The Baptists worshiped the next Lord's Day in the yard, and afterward built a shed for protection from the weather. A week later they found the doors open, by whose agency they knew not, and worshiped in the building. For this they were again summoned (May 11). Eight days later they were "admonished" and "their offense past" forgiven, but they were "still prohibited" "to meet in that public place they have built, or any other public house except such as are allowed by lawful authority."

Pastor Russell at about this time wrote a "Narrative" of the sufferings of the Boston Baptist church, which was published in England, with a preface by William Kiffin, Daniel Dyke, William Collins, Hanserd Knollys, John Harris, and Nehemiah Cox, the leading Particular Baptist ministers of England at that time. These ministers express amazement that those who fled persecution and sought liberty of conscience in the New World, with their immediate successors, should persecute their brethren for differences in religion. "For one Protestant congregation

to persecute another, where there is no pretense to infallibility in the decision of all controversies, seems much more unreasonable than the cruelties of the Church of Rome towards them that depart from their superstitions."

In 1681 Samuel Willard published a reply to Russell's "Narrative," with a preface by Increase Mather, who repudiates the representation that the New England anti-pedobaptists are persecuted "merely for a supposed error about the subject of baptism." He agrees that "Protestants ought not to persecute any," but thinks it "cannot be rationally denied" "that Protestants may punish Protestants." He entreats his English Baptist "brethren" "seriously to consider: 1. That the place may sometimes make a great alteration as to the indulgence to be expected. It is evident that that toleration is in one place, not only lawful, but a necessary duty, which in another place would be destructive; and the expectation of it irrational. That which is needful to ballast a great ship will sink a small boat. . . . 2. Let them consider that those of their persuasion in this place have acted with so much irregularity and profaneness, that should men of any persuasion whatsoever have done the like, the same severity would have been used towards them." This last statement, in view of all the facts presented on both sides, cannot be regarded as other than slanderous. The sum of their offending had been their refusal to have their children baptized, their refusal to witness the administration of the rite, and in a few cases somewhat demonstrative protestations of dissatisfaction with what they regarded as an utter perversion of an ordinance of Christ.

The sentiment of the dominant party toward the Baptists at this time is probably faithfully represented by Willard in the work referred to: "They say baptized persons are true matter of a visible church, and they say those that

were only sprinkled in their infancy were never baptized; and will not this undermine the foundation of all the churches in the world but theirs? and what more pernicious! they had even as good cry with Edom's sons, Raze it, raze it to the foundation! . . . Experience tells us that such a rough thing as a New England Anabaptist is not to be handled overtenderly." Hubbard sought to bring Russell into contempt by stigmatizing him as "a wedder-drop'd shoemaker."

It appears that the authorities now yielded to the pressure at home and from abroad, and desisted from their efforts to suppress the Baptist meeting. Elder Russell died December 21, 1680. Elder Hull seems to have been for some time associated with him in the pastoral guidance of the church. The chief responsibility soon came to rest upon Ellis Callender and Edward Drinker. In 1684 the church secured the services of John Emblen, an English Baptist minister, who continued with them till his death in 1699. After fruitless efforts to obtain another pastor from England, Ellis Callender, who had for thirty years been one of the most active members of the church, was called to the pastoral office. He was ordained in 1708, and ministered to the flock till 1718, when he was willing to lay the burden upon the shoulders of his son Elisha, a Harvard graduate.

As indicating the change of sentiment on the part of the ministers of the standing order in relation to the Baptists, it is interesting to note that in 1714, after relief from great distress, the Baptists were invited to join with the other churches in acknowledging the "favours of our prayer-hearing Lord, with the solemnities of a thanksgiving." Cotton Mather, who yet in his "*Magnalia*" was ungenerous and unfair in his treatment of the Baptists, communicated the invitation in courteous style. It is addressed

"to my worthy friend, Mr. Ellis Callender, elder of a church of Christ in Boston." Evidently, prejudice against Baptists had lost much of its pristine bitterness.

By 1718 the relations between the Baptists of Boston and the representatives of the standing order had become so cordial that, on the occasion of the ordination of Elisha Callender, the aged Increase Mather was invited to give the right hand of fellowship, and his son, Cotton Mather, to preach the ordination sermon. These invitations were graciously accepted, and the duties involved gracefully performed. The sermon was a somewhat remarkable plea for unity and brotherly love as far as conscience will allow, and for toleration of differences when agreement cannot be attained. "Let good men go as far as they can without sin in holding communion with one another. But where sinful terms are imposed, there let them make their stops; there a separation becomes a duty; there the injunction of Heaven upon them is, Be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you."

With a highly educated and zealous young pastor thus recognized by the most prominent ministers and churches of the Congregational way, the Boston Baptist church is at last freed from the harassments of the earlier time and from the struggle for mere existence, and is in a position to carry forward its work with vigor and comfort. Ellis Callender had won the respect of his fellow-citizens, and to a still greater extent, no doubt, his liberally educated son enjoyed the esteem of the community. His labors as pastor of this church terminated with his life in 1738. He was succeeded by Jeremiah Condy, a young Englishman sent out at the request of the church, who was ordained in 1739 and served the church for twenty-five years. His Arminianism and his opposition to the great revival led to the organization of the Second Boston Church in 1743.

It seems to have been due, in some measure at least, to the influence of Elisha Callender that Thomas Hollis, a wealthy English Baptist, and his descendants for two or three generations contributed with a generosity unusual at that time to the equipment and endowment of Harvard College. It appears that Hollis had become acquainted with President Increase Mather during a visit of the latter to England, and when he learned of the courtesy and good-will shown to the Baptists by President Mather and his son in connection with the ordination of Elisha Callender, he decided to make Harvard College an object of his benefactions. He provided for the education of a number of Baptist students for the ministry at the college, and urged upon the ministers of the various Baptist churches of America the importance of sending suitable young men to be educated on these foundations. He also gave great encouragement to other Baptist ministers as well as Callender through gifts of books and in other delicate ways. His name will ever be honored as that of one of the noblest benefactors of the Baptist cause and the cause of Christian education.

The First Baptist Church of Boston became, as might have been expected, the mother of churches. The Newbury church was formed in 1682, with the assent and no doubt with the coöperation of the Boston church. It is probable that several of its constituent members had been connected with the older church (Backus, i., 405 ; cf. Weston's foot-note on same page). The church organized by William Screven, Humphrey Churchwood, and others at Kittery, Me., during the same year, was likewise due to Boston influence. The important and interesting history of this movement we shall have occasion to narrate elsewhere. By 1694 there were two Indian Baptist churches in Massachusetts, one on Martha's Vineyard

and another on Nantucket Island. Thomas Mayhew, the proprietor of Martha's Vineyard, had treated the natives so humanely that large numbers of them had accepted the gospel. His son ministered to them in spiritual things. The first to introduce Baptist views among them appears to have been Peter Foulger, who was employed as a teacher among them during the absence in England of the younger Mayhew. So friendly were these Indians that during the terrible wars of 1676 onward they remained faithful to the English. Foulger became a member of the First Newport Church about 1675. One of his grandsons was Benjamin Franklin. The first Indian Baptist pastor of whom we are informed was John Tackamason. Though not himself a Baptist, Mayhew expressed the highest confidence in his Christian character: "I had frequent conversation with him while he was in health, and sometimes . . . in the time of that long sickness whereof he died; and never from first to last saw anything by him that made me any ways suspect the integrity of his heart, but did ever think him to be a godly and discreet man." His death occurred in 1708. A Six Principle Baptist church was formed at Swansea in 1693 under the leadership of Thomas Barnes. In 1732 a Baptist church was formed in Rehoboth under the ministry of the learned and zealous John Comer, who had given up the pastorate of the First Church, Newport, on account of his acceptance of the doctrine of the laying on of hands, but, unlike most Six Principle Baptists, continued to be an earnest Calvinist. Thirty members withdrew from the First Church, Swansea, without ill-will on either side so far as appears, to form the new church. The elders and messengers of the Swansea church assisted in the installation of the pastor. A revival ensued immediately upon the organization, and in less than two years the church had a membership of ninety-five. Comer labored with

consuming zeal, his evangelistic efforts extending far beyond the limits of his own community. He died of consumption in his thirtieth year, May 23, 1734. Though his life was thus cut short, the life-work of few of his contemporaries was more fruitful. Largely through the influence of the labors of Comer in 1632, a Baptist church was organized at Sutton, September, 1635, of which two years later Benjamin Marsh and Thomas Green became joint pastors. The church divided by mutual agreement in September, 1738, Green becoming pastor of the new Leicester church. In November, 1736, a Baptist church was organized at Brimfield, and five years later Ebenezer Moulton, whose ancestor, Robert Moulton, had been a member of the first House of Representatives at Boston in 1634, but who was among those disarmed in 1637 in connection with the antinomian controversy (Backus, ii., 31, and Weston's note), became pastor.

CHAPTER VII.

BAPTISTS IN PENNSYLVANIA AND THE JERSEYS.¹

THE Jerseys and Pennsylvania from about 1682 onward had a strong attraction for all radical types of evangelical life. Here the Baptists rooted themselves more firmly than in almost any other part of America, and here they attained to a perfection of organization and to a degree of unity and uniformity in doctrine and polity that could be found nowhere else on the continent. The confirmation of England's claim to the possession of New Jersey in 1674 and of the grants of this territory by the crown to the Duke of York and by him to Sir George Carteret and to Lord John Berkeley, whose toleration principles had become well known through their earlier relations to this territory, and especially the purchase of Lord Berkeley's interest by the Quakers Fenwicke and Byllynge, caused a large influx of Quakers and Baptists from England and elsewhere. The Quakers had control of West Jersey from 1677 onward. After the death of Carteret his interests were purchased by a company of Quakers, of whom William Penn was the chief (February, 1682, N. S.). Thus a large and attractive region was opened up for settlement on the most liberal terms. Even more important to the cause of religious freedom and to the settlement of the country with radical and primitive types of Christianity was the purchase of Pennsylvania by William Penn, the Quaker

¹ Cf. Morgan Edwards; Benedict; "Min. Phil. Bapt. Assoc.;" Spencer; Cook; Jones, "Hist. Sk. Lower Dublin Baptist Church."

capitalist, statesman, and philanthropist, in 1681. It is one of the marvels of history that such a king as Charles II. should have sold to such a man as William Penn so large and valuable a territory as Pennsylvania on terms so highly favorable to civil and religious freedom, and with the certainty that it would be used for the freest development of what was then regarded as one of the most radical forms of Christianity. The authority of Penn in the government of the province was made practically unlimited. But he had purchased the territory not for his own sake, but for the advancement of truth and righteousness. The rapidity with which the territory was settled by Quakers from England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, by Mennonites, Dunkards, and Pietists from Germany and the Netherlands, and by Baptists from Wales and elsewhere, was unprecedented in the history of American colonization. Many of all classes were attracted from the older colonies by the civil and religious freedom and by the advantages of climate and soil that the new commonwealth offered. By 1685 the population had reached 7200 and embraced French, Dutch, Germans, Swedes, Finns, and Scotch-Irish, besides large numbers of English and Welsh.

The first Baptist church organized in these Quaker provinces was that at Cold Spring, Bucks County, Pa. It was founded about 1684 by Thomas Dungan, an Irish Baptist minister, who had been for some time a member of the Newport church. Little is known of the man or his work. He was already advanced in years. Keach characterized him as "an ancient disciple and teacher among the Baptists." The church had become extinct by 1702, Dungan having died in 1688 and no efficient leader having appeared to take his place. Dungan's posterity amounted in 1770, according to Morgan Edwards, to between six and seven hundred.

The next church to be organized in Pennsylvania was that at Lower Dublin, or Pennepek. In 1686 several Baptist families from Radnorshire, Wales, together with an Irish and an English Baptist, settled on the banks of the Pennepek River. At about the same time Elias Keach, son of Benjamin Keach, the famous English Baptist minister and author, came as a youthful adventurer to Pennsylvania. Whether from mere wantonness or from a desire by fraud to secure a livelihood, he assumed the clerical dress and passed himself off as a minister of the gospel, being at the time an utter stranger to divine grace. As a son of Benjamin Keach he found ready access to the little band of Baptists on the Pennepek, and it was arranged that he should preach for them. When he was in the midst of his discourse the enormity of his sin dawned upon him. He was overcome by remorse, confessed his imposture, and was soon afterward a rejoicing believer. He was baptized and ordained to the ministry by Elder Dungan. A number who had been converted under his ministry and baptized by him joined with the original company in organizing themselves into a church, January, 1688. A number of scattered Baptists in other parts of the province and in West Jersey united with them. Through the earnest evangelistic efforts of young Keach, baptized believers were soon to be found at the Falls, Cold Spring, Burlington, Cohansey, Salem, Penn's Neck, Chester, Philadelphia, and other places. These continued for some time to be members of the Pennepek church, where they met from time to time to break bread, preaching services being held in each locality as often as convenient, while four quarterly meetings were held for evangelistic and communion purposes at Burlington, Cohansey, Chester, and Philadelphia, in rotation. Keach's return to England in 1692 was a severe loss to this widespread Baptist community. He

seems to have resigned the pastorate of the Pennepek church in 1689 on account of controversy on the laying on of hands, and to have spent the two years following as an evangelist. One effect of the cultivation of so wide a field by the pastor and members was the development of the gifts of the brethren. During the pastor's absence from Pennepek weekly "meetings for conference" were sustained, and in the out-stations of the church brethren were raised up who could conduct the services to edification. Keach was succeeded in the pastorate by John Watts, one of the constituent members; and Samuel Jones, another, was appointed to conduct the home services during the pastor's absence. Jones and Evan Morgan, who had been for some time active in church work, were ordained to the pastorate in 1706. Serious and long-continued difficulties marred the life of the church during the last years of the century. The questions causing trouble were absolute predestination, the laying on of hands, psalm-singing, and Sabbatarianism.

The church at Piscataqua, N. J., was gathered by Thomas Killingsworth about 1689. Killingsworth was one of the most zealous and successful of the Baptist ministers of this region and was instrumental in founding a number of churches. He seems to have been an ordained minister in England. For some years he added to his labors as a minister those of county judge. It has been thought probable that the nucleus of this church was due to the influence of Hanserd Knollys, who labored in Piscataqua, N. H., 1638-41. Knollys was not a Baptist at the time, but Baptist views appeared in the community a few years later, possibly through his teachings. It is said further that those who sympathized with Knollys went to Long Island, whence they removed to New Jersey. The name given to their settlement (Piscataqua) would seem to favor the

theory. But we should beware of building on so slender a basis of fact. The church when organized consisted of only six members. After about twenty years the number had increased to twenty, and by 1746 to one hundred.

About 1701 a member of the church, named Dunham, admonished a neighbor for working on Sunday. He was asked to prove the holiness of the first day. As a result of his examination of the question he was led to adopt Sabbatarian views. About seventeen members of the church joined with him in organizing a Seventh-day Baptist church in 1705. Dunham became the pastor of the church and in 1734 was succeeded by his son. As an offshoot from this church another Seventh-day church was formed at Shiloh, about forty miles south of Philadelphia, in 1737.

The church at Middletown, N. J., was probably organized in 1687 or 1688. A considerable Baptist community, made up of immigrants from Rhode Island and Long Island, had been on the ground since 1665. Among the Rhode Islanders was a son of Obadiah Holmes. Keach and Killingsworth both bestowed considerable labor on this field. By 1711 the church had become involved in doctrinal controversy. The two pastors, Brown and Okison, had been silenced by the contending factions. A council of sister-churches was called in 1712 to seek an adjustment of the differences. The decision of the council was that the members should sign Elias Keach's Confession of Faith, at least the Covenant annexed to it. Those who should conform to this requirement would be recognized as the only regular Baptist church in those parts. Of the sixty-eight members forty-two subscribed, while twenty-six refused. It was further recommended that the recusants should be tenderly dealt with. There is no evidence that the minority effected a separate organization. The

two brethren who had been silenced were ordered by the council to remain silent. The recommendation "to bury their proceedings in oblivion and erase the record of them" seems to have been observed so far as removing from the book the leaves containing the record is concerned. The church secured John Burrows as pastor the next year, who served them till his death. At the close of the present period Abel Morgan, who was soon to become one of the most noted Baptist preachers of the time, had just entered upon the pastorate of this church.

The nucleus of the Cohansey, N. J., church was formed, it would seem, by a small company of Baptists from Tipperary, Ireland, who settled in the community about 1687. They were joined two years later by Obadiah Holmes, Jr., and John Cornelius, both from Rhode Island. Keach bestowed considerable labor upon this field also and baptized a number in 1688. The organization of the church was effected about 1691. Killingsworth remained pastor of the church till his death, in 1708, and was assisted by Holmes, who was judge of the Common Pleas in Salem Court. A party of Baptists from Swansea, Mass., had settled in the neighborhood before the church was organized, and under the leadership of Timothy Brooks maintained a separate meeting until after Killingsworth's death. This was due to differences of opinion on predestination, psalm-singing, the laying on of hands, etc. The two bodies now united under the pastorate of Brooks, who died two years later. During the latter part of this period the church was served chiefly by Nathaniel Jenkins, pastor of the Cape May church, who finally settled at Cohansey.

The formal organization of the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia did not occur until 1698, although services had been held in the city under the auspices of the Pennepk church from 1687 onward. John Holmes, who also

occupied a high judicial position, and who as judge on one occasion refused to act with the Quaker magistrates against the Keithian Quakers, is the first Baptist known to have settled in Philadelphia. He seems to have arrived in 1686. A number of English Baptists took up their residence in the city in 1696 and 1697. In the latter year Thomas Killingsworth baptized a considerable number in Philadelphia, including two Keithian Quakers. From this time onward the relations of this church to the Keithians become interesting and important. The schism in the Quaker body led by George Keith, who bitterly attacked the body on the ground of its exaltation of the inner light and its comparative disparagement of Scripture authority, its neglect of discipline, its departure from the earlier teaching of the body with reference to warfare, magistracy, etc., led to some gain in numbers by the Baptists, but involved them in somewhat serious troubles as well. Keith himself forsook his followers and entered the Episcopal Church. Some of the Keithians returned to the regular Quakers, some united with one denomination, and some with another. Yet several congregations held together, notably those of Upper Providence, Philadelphia, Southampton, and Lower Dublin. According to Morgan Edwards, "These, by resigning themselves to the guidance of Scripture, began to find water in the commission; bread and wine in the command; community of goods, love-feast, kiss of charity, right hand of fellowship, anointing the sick for recovery, and washing the disciples' feet; and therefore were determined to practice accordingly. The society of Keithians most forward in these matters was that kept at the house of Thomas Powell, in Upper Providence; which forwardness, it is said, was due to one Abel Noble, who visited them, and was a Seventh-day Baptist minister when he arrived in this country. The time they began to put

their designs in practice was Jan. 28, 1697, when the said Abel Noble baptized a public Friend, whose name was Thomas Martin. . . . Afterwards Mr. Martin baptized other Quakers, to the number of 16." Beckingham, a member of the Cohansey church, joined with them in organizing a church, of which Martin was chosen pastor by lot. Fifteen other Quakers soon united with the church. "But in 1700 a difference arose among them, touching the Sabbath, which broke up the society. Such as adhered to the observation of the Seventh day, kept together at Newtown. . . . The rest lay scattered in the neighborhood, till Mr. Abel Morgan gathered together 15 of them, and formed them into a society, now called the church of Brandywine." This latter was a regular Baptist church.

The Philadelphia society of Keithians built a meeting-house in 1692. Two of their members, William Davis and Thomas Rutter, were baptized by Killingsworth in 1697. The former united with the Pennepek church, the latter baptized nine others and organized them (1698) into a society on the basis of believers' baptism.

In 1699 the Baptists received an invitation from Thomas Clayton, rector of Christ Church, to unite with the Church of England. They replied in a dignified manner, declining to do so unless he could prove "that the Church of Christ under the New Testament may consist . . . of a mixed multitude and their seed, even all the members of a nation, . . . whether they are godly or ungodly," that "lords, archbishops, etc., . . . are of divine institution and appointment," and that their vestments, liturgical services, use of musical instruments, infant baptism, sprinkling, "signing with the cross in baptism," etc., are warranted by Scripture. In 1707 the Baptists were invited by the Keithians to unite with them and to make use of their building. This was the first meeting-house owned by the Phila-

delphia Baptists. One of the Keithians, not sympathizing with the union, gave a deed of the property to the Episcopalians, and the church, to avoid litigation, paid a sum of money to satisfy the claim. Grave difficulties were occasioned in the church (1711-12) by Thomas Selby, an Irish minister, who apart from these troubles afterward proved unworthy. The matter was referred to the Association in 1712. The result was that several of Selby's partisans withdrew from the church and united with other denominations. The independence of the Philadelphia church was not recognized until 1746. The occasion of the declaration of independence was the desire of the mother-church to share in certain legacies that had been left to the Philadelphia body.

The church which came to be known as the Welsh Tract church was organized in Pembrokeshire, Wales, in 1701, and emigrated the same year to Pennsylvania. They first settled in the Pennepek region, but having their own pastor, Thomas Griffith, and not agreeing in all points with the Pennepek church, they continued their separate existence. In 1703 they received a large grant of land on the Delaware, known as the Welsh Tract, where they greatly prospered, and were able to furnish to the denomination some of its ablest ministers and to send forth a strong colony to South Carolina (see previous chapter). According to Morgan Edwards, this church "was the principal, if not sole, means of introducing singing, imposition of hands, church covenant, etc., among the Baptists in the Middle States." Thomas Griffith, pastor of the church, labored zealously for the promotion of the laying on of hands, and by 1712 "all the ministers" in the Jerseys "had submitted to the ordinance."

Other churches were organized before the close of this period, as follows: The church at the Great Valley, made

up chiefly of Welsh Baptists, who had been supplied with gospel privileges by the Welsh Tract church, was constituted in 1711, and chose Hugh Davis, an ordained minister from Wales, to be their pastor; the Hopewell, N. J., church was organized in 1715, of those who had been members of the Middletown, Philadelphia, and Pennepek churches, and was for some time dependent on the visits of neighboring pastors; the Brandywine church, already mentioned, composed chiefly of those who had been Keithians, was constituted in 1715, and was largely dependent on the Welsh Tract for gospel privileges; the church at Montgomery, county of Philadelphia, was made up of Welsh Baptists, whose numbers were increased through the labors of Abel Morgan. The organization of this church was effected in 1719. Benjamin Griffith became its pastor in 1725.

The antipedobaptist life of Pennsylvania was augmented by the immigration of large numbers of Dutch Mennonites, 1692 onward. By 1724 they had five large congregations and sixteen ministers. In 1719 about twenty families of Dunkards reached Pennsylvania. They had originated at Schwartzenu, Germany, in 1708, under the leadership of Alexander Mack, and had introduced believers' baptism anew, after the manner of John Smyth and Roger Williams. They practiced trine immersion, and attempted to follow rigidly apostolic precept and example as regards refusal to go to law, feet-washing, the kiss of peace, the love-feast, anointing with oil, refusal to accept interest on money, etc. The entire body came to America (1719 and 1729). About 1730 a schism occurred in the Dunkard body on the Sabbath question, community of goods, etc., the Sabbatarian party forming the Ephrata community at Lancaster, Pa. It is uncertain to what extent these bodies influenced the Baptist movement; but as they were very exclusive and fixed in their customs it is unlikely that many of them,

especially in the earlier time, passed over to the Baptists, or that many Baptists passed over to them.

All the conditions were present in Pennsylvania and the Jerseys for the development of strong and well-ordered Baptist churches. Religious liberty relieved Baptists of the necessity of being always on the defensive and spending their strength in the effort to exist. There was no overshadowing and domineering church party to cause them to be looked down upon as sectaries and intruders and to look upon themselves as martyrs and aliens. While the Quakers were numerous and in many cases wealthy, they were for the most part free from arrogance and intolerance, and Baptists were able to be and feel themselves citizens in the fullest sense. This was true, also, of Rhode Island; but Rhode Island Baptists were for the most part such as had had experience of New England intolerance, and the materials they drew from in the extension of their work were of a thoroughly heterogeneous character. They were likely to emphasize liberty and independence at the expense of organization and interdependence. The prevailing Welsh element among Pennsylvania Baptists had come from churches well grounded in an evangelical type of Calvinism and in Baptist principles and practices. They combined evangelical zeal and fervor with thoroughgoing denominational self-respect. The slight admixture of Rhode Island Baptists with the prevailing Welsh element tended to give to the resultant Baptist type a juster sense of the importance of emphasizing the doctrine of religious liberty than might otherwise have found place.

No agency did so much for the solidifying and extension of the Baptist denomination in the American colonies as the Philadelphia Association. That it could be formed and could from the beginning secure the coöperation of a number of churches in efforts to promote discipline, right

church order, soundness of teaching, and aggressive evangelization, argues the antecedent existence in the churches concerned of a sense of the importance of these things and a willingness to limit the exercise of their independency for the sake of securing these ends.

Almost from the beginning general meetings had been held for evangelistic and communion purposes. These began under the ministry of Keach, when a number of widely scattered bands of believers were still connected with the Pennepek church. After the organization of these bands into churches it is probable that such meetings were continued, all who could gathering and participating. In 1707 the general meeting assumed in part the character of an Association. The following account is from the records of the Pennepek church: "Before our general meeting, held at Philadelphia, in the seventh month, 1707, it was concluded by the several congregations of our judgment, to make a choice of some particular brethren, such as they thought most capable in every congregation, and those to meet at the yearly meeting to consult about such things as were wanting in the churches, and to set them in order; and these brethren meeting at the said yearly meeting . . . agreed to continue the meeting till the third day following in the work of the public ministry. It was then agreed, that a person that is a stranger, that has neither letter of recommendation, nor is known to be a person gifted, and of a good conversation, shall not be admitted to preach, nor be entertained as a member in any of the baptized congregations in communion with each other. It was also concluded, that if any difference shall happen between any member and the church he belongs unto, and they cannot agree, then the person so grieved may, at the general meeting, appeal to the brethren of the several congregations, and with such as they shall nominate, to decide

the difference; that the church and the person so grieved do fully acquiesce in their determination." Subsequent records show that this latter arrangement was carried out with great consistency, wisdom, and efficiency, and there can be no doubt that churches were thereby saved from wrecking.

It is recorded that in 1710 and the year following "several able men, ministers and elders, . . . came over from South Wales and the West of England—as the Rev. Mr. Nathaniel Jenkins, Mr. John Burrows, Mr. Abel Morgan, and some that had been ruling elders in the churches they came from—all of them men long concerned in the affairs of churches and associations in their own countries."

The first important case of discipline seems to have been that of the Philadelphia church and Thomas Selby. The finding of the disciplinary committee of the Association was "that the way and manner of dealing with each other hath been from the rule of the Gospel, and unbecoming Christians in many respects, and in some too shameful here to enumerate the particulars. And first, we judge it expedient in point of justice, that Mr. Thomas Selby be paid the money subscribed to him by the members of this church, and he be discharged from any further service in the work of the ministry; he being a person, in our judgment, not likely for the promotion of the Gospel in these parts of the country; and considering his miscarriages, we judge he may not be allowed to communion. And secondly, as to the members of this congregation, we do apprehend the best way is, that each party offended do freely forgive each other all personal and other offences that may have arisen on this occasion, and that they be buried in oblivion; and that those who shall for future mention or stir up any of the former differences, so as to tend to contention, shall be deemed disorderly persons, and be dealt

with as such. And thirdly, that those that exempted themselves from their communion on this account, except as above, be allowed to take their places orderly without contention, and such as refuse, to be deemed disorderly persons." This action is quoted to show the nature and spirit of the Associational work in its early stages.

In 1722 it is decided that the churches shall "make inquiry among themselves, if they have any young persons hopeful for the ministry, and inclinable for learning," such cases to be reported to Mr. Abel Morgan for education on Mr. Hollis's account.

In 1723 churches without ministers are advised to meet for devotional exercises, and to "have due regard to order and decency in the exercise of those gifts at all times, and not to suffer any to exercise their gifts in a mixed multitude until tried and approved of first by the church." It is further "agreed, that the proposal drawn up by the several ministers, and signed by many others, in reference to the examination of all gifted brethren and ministers that come in here from other places, be duly put in practice, we having found the evil of neglecting a true and previous scrutiny in those affairs."

Several queries were sent in to the meeting of 1724. The first was "concerning the fourth commandment, whether changed, altered, or diminished." It is answered by referring to the Confession of Faith of 1689, "owned by us," where the "Lord's day" is declared to be "the Christian Sabbath," "to be continued to the end of the world," "the observation of the last day of the week being abolished." A negative answer is given to the query, "Whether a believer may marry an unbeliever, without coming under church censure for it?" It was also "concluded and agreed, that a church ought to be unanimous in giving their voice in choosing and setting up, or depos-

ing one set up, to act in any church office. . . . Any act of that nature commenced without common consent, is void, and hath no power in it." As an indication of the wise care that characterized the action of this body, it may be mentioned that at the same session it was decided that in the letters of the churches "salutations, contemplations, congratulations, etc.," should be given on one page, to be read in the open meeting, while "complaints, queries, grievances, etc.," should "be written apart" and "be opened and read to the Association only."

In 1726 the Association decided that "in case there might be a division . . . in any church in Great Britain, and each party combining together in church form, each being sound in the faith, and during the separation both parties recommend members unto us here, as in full communion with them," the churches should "take no further notice of the letters by such persons brought here, than to satisfy themselves that such are baptized persons and of a regular conversation, and to take such into church covenant as if they had not been members of any church before."

It has been noticed that in the early history of the denomination in Pennsylvania differences of opinion appeared with respect to the laying on of hands. By 1729 practical unanimity seems to have been reached in favor of the rite. The following query was answered in the negative: "Suppose a gifted brother, who is esteemed an orderly minister by or among those that are against the laying on of hands in any respect [even in ordination to the ministry, seems to be the thought], should happen to come among our church; whether we may allow such an one to administer the ordinances . . . ?"

Sabbatarianism was evidently giving some trouble in 1730. There was a disposition on the part of the churches

to allow full liberty to such as persisted, on conscientious grounds, in observing the seventh day; but such as withdrew from the church and associated themselves actively with the Seventh-day people should be disowned "in as moderate a way and manner" as possible.

In 1731 and 1732 much anxiety was expressed on account of the dearth of pastors, and in the latter year a day of fasting and prayer was appointed to be kept by all the churches "that the Lord may gift some among ourselves, such as may be serviceable; or order, in the course of his providence, some such to come among us from elsewhere." In 1736 it was voted that a church at a distance should not receive into membership a person living in the neighborhood of another church.

The period closes amid prosperity, one hundred and eleven having been received by baptism during the year ending with September, 1740.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIRST BAPTISTS OF MAINE, SOUTH CAROLINA, VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, CONNECTICUT, AND NEW YORK.¹

THE reason for coupling two regions so remote from each other as Maine and South Carolina will appear in the course of the narrative.

In January, 1682, the Boston Baptist church received a letter written on behalf of a body of Baptists who had gathered themselves for Christian worship at Kittery, in the province of Maine, by Humphrey Churchwood, and borne, it would seem, by one of the members of this body, William Screven by name. After words of salutation, in apostolic style, the writer proceeds: "Most dearly beloved brethren and friends, as I am, through free grace, a member of the same body and joined to the same Head, Christ Jesus, I thought it my special duty to inform you that the tender mercy of God in and through Jesus Christ, hath shined upon us by giving light to them that sit in darkness, and to guide our feet in the way of peace; for a great door, and effectual, is opened in these parts, and there are many adversaries. . . . Therefore I signify unto you, that here are a competent number of well-established people whose hearts the Lord hath opened insomuch that they have gladly received the word and do seriously pro-

¹ Backus; Burrage; "Hist. First Bapt. Ch. of S. Ca.;" "Early Rec. Prov. of Maine," vol. iv.; Semple; Armitage; Trumbull; True; Winsor, "Nar. and Cr. Hist. of Am.," vols. iii. and v.

fess their hearty desire to the following of Christ and to partake of all his holy ordinances, according to his blessed institution and divine appointment; therefore I present my ardent desire to your serious consideration, which is, if the Lord see it fit, to have a gospel church planted here in this place; and in order hereunto, we think it meet that our beloved brother, William Screven, who is, through free grace, gifted and endued with the spirit of veterans, [and has been] called by us, who are visibly joined to the church. When our beloved brother is ordained according to the sacred rule of the Lord Jesus, our humble petition is to God that he will be pleased to carry on this good work to the glory of his holy name, and to the enlarging of the kingdom of his beloved Son."

The Boston brethren were not slow to respond to this request. Eight days after Churchwood's letter was written the church issued the following certificate, signed by Isaac Hull and John Farnum: "To all whom it may concern: These are to certify, that our beloved brother William Screven is a member in communion with us, and having had trial of his gifts among us, and finding him to be a man whom God hath qualified and furnished with the gifts of his Holy Spirit and grace, enabling him to open and apply the word of God, which through the blessing of the Lord Jesus may be useful in his hand, for the begetting and building up of souls in the knowledge of God, do therefore appoint, approve, and encourage him, to exercise his gift in the place where he lives, or elsewhere, as the providence of God may cast him; and so the Lord help him to eye his glory in all things, and to walk humbly in the fear of his name."

From Churchwood's letter it seems evident that a body of baptized believers had already been organized and had appointed Screven to the pastoral office; but that they

did not consider themselves competent to administer the ordinances until their minister elect should have received ordination at the hands of a regularly constituted church, and until the new organization should have been recognized by an older. It is probable that most or all of those who joined in the Kittery organization had been members of Baptist churches in England. It is highly probable that the pastor of the Kittery church is identical with the William Scriven who, as a representative of the Somerton church, was among the signers of the "Confession of the Faith of several Churches of Christ in the County of Somerset [England], and of some Churches in the Counties near adjacent," set forth in 1656. As he was born about 1629 he was twenty-five years of age at the time. The fact that the settlement effected by him in South Carolina was named Somerton would go far toward establishing this identification; but the supposition that it was his father who signed the Confession would meet the case equally well. It is almost certain that he was a member of the Somerton church. The date of his arrival in Maine is unknown, but it must have been at some time previous to November 15, 1673, when his name appears in a deed at Kittery. The following year he was married to a daughter of Robert Cutts, a prosperous ship-builder, one of whose brothers was the first president of New Hampshire. This would seem to have been Screven's second marriage, as a son of his named William was a member of the General Court in 1694.

As early as 1675 we find him presented by the grand jury "for not frequenting the public meeting according to law on the Lord's days." It was shown, however, that he attended another meeting of the established religion. After serving in a number of other public offices, he was appointed a deputy from Kittery in 1681.

Screven prolonged his absence in connection with his ordination till some time after the 25th of January, for on that date Churchwood wrote to Boston, referring somewhat impatiently to his failure to return and take charge of the persecuted flock: "By his long absence from us, he has given great advantage to our adversaries to triumph and to endeavor to bear down that good beginning which God, by his poor instrument, hath begun among us: and our magistrate, Mr. Hooke, is almost every day summoning and threatening the people by fines and other penalties, if ever they come to our meeting any more, five shillings for every such offence." Screven returned to Kittery shortly afterward, and little time had elapsed before he was summoned before the court "upon rumors and reports from a common fame of some presumptuous speeches about the holy ordinance of baptism which should pass from him." He admitted that he conceived infant baptism "no ordinance of God, but an invention of man"; but did not admit that he had "said it was an ordinance of the devil." He "put us to prove by any positive command in the Gospel, or Scriptures, that there was infant baptism, and, according to our understanding, he endeavored to make good the matter of his words, and to put the manner of them into a smoother dress, mincing the matter, as Edward Rishworth told him; whose reply was that mincing it was to put it in better terms than it deserved, charging Mr. Hooke with prejudice, who brought him thither, and desired not to be judged by him." A bond of one hundred pounds was required for his release, which Screven refused to furnish, accepting imprisonment instead.

On April 12th he was tried before the court at York, fined ten pounds, forbidden to hold any further meetings in the province, and ordered to conform in religious mat-

ters to "the laws here established in the Province, upon such penalties as the law requires upon his neglect of the premises."

On June 28th following he appeared before the General Assembly of the province. "The Court tendered him liberty to return home to his family, in case he would forbear such kind of disorderly and turbulent practices and amend for the future. But he refusing, the Court required him to give bond for his good behavior, and to forbear such contemptuous behavior for the future, and ordered that the delinquent should stand committed until the judgment of this Court herein be fulfilled. After which said Screven, coming into the Court, did, in the presence of the said Court, and president, promise and engage to depart out of this Province in a very short time."

As no definite time had been fixed for his departure, and as his own business interests as well as the interests of the little society of Baptists were at stake, he doubtless felt justified in putting the most liberal interpretation on the requirement of the court to which he had assented. He seems to have been particularly anxious that the organization of the church should be completed in the most regular fashion before his departure. In September he requested the Boston church to send the pastor and other delegates to assist them in entering upon a church estate. His mother-in-law had accepted Baptist views and wished to be baptized. "We all conceive it will be more honorable and expedient that it be done by the Elder Hull, that is so truly praised here. I pray you to consider these things. Both may be done [the organization of the church and the baptism] when the messengers come up to us." It is probable that Hull had visited the Kittery Baptists before this correspondence began. It may be that the growth of Baptist sentiment had been due chiefly

to his evangelistic efforts. Again the Boston church, ever ready for Christian service, responded to the request of the Kittery Baptists, and on September 25th William Screven, elder, Humphrey Churchwood, deacon, Robert Williams, John Morgandy, Richard Cutts, Timothy Davis, Leonard Drown, William Adams, Humphrey Azell, George Litten, and a number of sisters united in signing a solemn covenant of fellowship and service. It has commonly been supposed that Screven and his associates left Kittery for South Carolina at the end of 1682 or the beginning of 1683. The records of the province show, however, that they were still at Kittery as late as October 9, 1683, when the following entry occurs: "William Screven, being brought before this Court for not departing this Province according to a former confession of Court, and his own choice, and denying now to fulfill it, this Court doth declare that the sentence of the General Assembly, bearing date the 28th of June, 1682, stands good and in full force against the said William Screven during the Court's pleasure." Some months later, May 27, 1684, an order was issued for Screven "to appear before the General Assembly in June next." It is possible, though not probable, that the last order was intended for his son William, who remained at Kittery after his father's departure. But we have no evidence of collision with the authorities on the part of the younger Screven, and it is not certain that he had reached his majority at this time. With a number of his brethren Screven made his way to South Carolina, where he formed a settlement on the Cooper River, a few miles above its junction with the Ashley River, where Charleston was afterward formed. No writer consulted has suggested a reason for this choice of a settlement, beyond the fact that the colony had been founded on broad principles of toleration. It is probable that through his

wife's family, who had lived for years at Barbadoes, Screven knew of the colony of ninety-three persons that left England in 1669 under the leadership of William Sayle, who had been governor of Bermuda, and who was described by a contemporary as a "Puritan and Nonconformist, whose religious bigotry, advanced age, and failing health promised badly for the discharge of the task before him." After various disasters and a short sojourn in Bermuda, they sailed for South Carolina, where in April, 1670, they settled on the Ashley River, and named their settlement Charlestown in honor of the king. At about the same time Sir John Yeamans arrived as governor, bringing with him the first negro slaves introduced into the province. In 1677 he ordered the laying out of a town at the junction of the Ashley and Cooper Rivers, and thither the older Charlestown gradually removed. In 1674, after the conquest of the Dutch of New Amsterdam (New York) by the English, many of the former sought a new home in Carolina and settled at Jamestown on the Ashley. The charter of the colony provided for liberty of conscience; but though the Puritans and dissenters were in the majority, the cavaliers and churchmen were the official and privileged class, and had chief control of the resources of the province. For some time there was much of friction between these two elements, and the aristocratic class did not fail to show contempt for the humbler Puritanism.

In 1682-83 there was another accession to the population, which meant much to the Baptist cause in South Carolina and which may have been the determining reason for Screven's going thither. "The most valuable addition to its [Carolina's] population," says a competent authority (Grahame, "*Colonial Hist. of the U. S.*," i., 372), "was supplied by the immigration of a considerable number of pious and respectable dissenters from Somerset-

shire in England. This band of emigrants was led by Humphrey Blake, the brother . . . of the renowned Admiral Blake. . . . Humphrey Blake was a worthy, conscientious, and liberal man; and willingly devoted his fortune to facilitate the retirement of a number of dissenters with whom he was connected, from the persecutions they endured in England, and the greater calamities they apprehended from the probable accession of the Duke of York to the throne." Among these immigrants was Joseph Blake, a nephew of the admiral and a trustee of Lord Berkeley, one of the lords proprietors of the province. Lady Blake and her mother, Lady Axtell, were staunch Baptists, and Joseph Blake himself was thoroughly sympathetic with Baptist principles. He was soon to take a leading part in the affairs of the colony, and was for several years its governor. He had to do (along with Paul Grimball, a Baptist, and others) with the revision of the constitution, and his influence was uncompromisingly on the side of religious liberty. During his governorship, in 1696, the Huguenots, who had come to Carolina in large numbers after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), were "incorporated with the freemen of the colony." This action carried with it religious liberty for all but papists.

If the later date which the public records of the province of Maine seem to fix for the departure of Screven be accepted, he at once exchanged the harassments of Maine for a delightful and most promising field of labor. In any case, he soon found himself surrounded by a considerable number of sympathetic and highly influential souls, with freedom to exercise his ministry according to the dictates of his conscience.

About 1683 a colony of north Britons came to Carolina under the patronage of Lord Cardross. They are said to have been mostly Baptists. They settled on Port Royal

Island and claimed independence of the Charleston Court. Having failed to sustain this claim Lord Cardross returned to England, and the population, being exposed to the hostilities of Indians and Spaniards, removed (before 1686) to the mouth of the Edisto River. The Baptist part of the company became members of Screven's church at Somerton. Thus from many quarters, in the providence of God, a considerable band of zealous Baptists, many of them influentially connected, was gathered in the neighborhood of Charleston.

By 1693 a large proportion of the members of the church had been drawn by the growing commercial importance of Charleston to take up their residence there, and it was thought wise to transfer their meeting to the town. Until they built a house of worship they "held their worship at the house of one William Chapman in King Street." The lot on which the present building stands was presented to the church in 1699 by William Elliott. The Baptists were among the first to occupy this region with organized Christian work. An Episcopal minister seems to have been on the ground as early as 1680. Congregationalists from England and New England, French Protestants, and Quakers soon had their congregations and built their houses of worship in what was becoming the flourishing city of Charleston. In 1698, under strong Episcopal pressure, Governor Blake led the dissenters to agree to a provision "for settling a perpetual provision of one hundred and fifty pounds a year, with a house and other advantages, on the Episcopal minister" of Charleston (Grahame, i., 388). It was a measure fraught with evil, but was doubtless regarded as a political necessity at the time.

In 1700, just as the Baptists were entering their new meeting-house, they adopted the Confession of Faith set

forth in 1689 by "the ministers and messengers of, and concerned for, upwards of one hundred congregations in England and Wales (denying Arminianism)," and, by reason of its subsequent adoption (with slight modifications) by the Philadelphia Association, known in America as the Philadelphia Confession.

There was at this time a dearth of gospel privileges in Carolina outside of Charleston and its vicinity. The colony had a population of about fifty-five hundred, of whom three thousand were residents of Charleston. Outside of Charleston there is said to have been at that date no house of worship and no school. The Baptists were easily foremost in evangelical zeal. Screven, though advanced in age, was abundant in labors, and the Charleston church sent forth of its own numbers and procured from other communities those who carried the gospel to the neglected planters. The English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts furnished a number of missionaries from 1707 onward, but they found that in most cases they had been preceded by the Baptists (Humphrey, "Historical Account," pp. 88, 95, 108, etc.).

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the mistake of the dissenting interest in not contending more earnestly for equality of rights and privileges became manifest. The intolerance of the proprietaries had become more and more aggressive. In 1704, under the direction of Lord Granville, two laws were enacted, the aim of which was to deprive dissenters of all civil and religious rights and privileges. According to the first, "All persons that shall hereafter be chosen members of the Commons' House of Assembly, and sit in the same," were required "to take the oaths and subscribe the declaration appointed by this bill, and to conform to the religious worship of this Province, according to the Church of England, and to receive

the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the said Church." It was provided that in case the person receiving the highest number of votes should refuse to qualify by conformity to the Church of England, the person receiving the next highest number should be declared elected, and so on until the names voted for should have been exhausted. Thus it would be possible for a person receiving a small fraction of the votes cast to act as representative of the people. This act was followed up on the reassembling of the Commons by an Act establishing Religious Worship, which provided for the creation of a lay commission for the trial of ecclesiastical causes. It is worthy of note that some churchmen strenuously opposed the first bill on the ground of its injustice, and that many more opposed the second as an unwarrantable invasion of ecclesiastical rights. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts refused to send more missionaries until the latter act should be repealed. The tyranny of the party in power was so represented to the House of Lords that the queen was advised to annul these laws. The Board of Trade advised the annulment of the proprietary charter. The laws were annulled, and from this time onward it became evident that the charter would be revoked and that the province would come under direct royal control. The struggle to secure this end resulted in a triumph of the people over the lords proprietors and their representatives as early as 1720, though the change was not completed until 1729. Thus was brought to an end the feudalism under which the colony had long groaned; and while under the new charter the Church of England was the established church and was supported at the public expense, the toleration of evangelical forms of Christianity was complete. It is estimated that at least two thirds of the population at that

date were dissenters. In 1707 the province was divided into ecclesiastical parishes, and provision was made for the erection of a church and for the support of a minister in each.

Aged, infirm, and possessed of a competency, Screven laid down the duties of the pastorate in 1706 and retired to his farm, where Georgetown now stands. He left with the church as a memento and guide "An Ornament for Church Members," which was printed after his death. In conclusion he urged the church to secure with as little delay as possible "an able and faithful minister. Be sure you take care that the person be orthodox in the faith, and of blameless life, and does own the Confession of Faith put forth by our brethren in London, in 1689." But his evangelical zeal was too great to allow him to be idle. We soon find him laboring earnestly in the regions round about his home. The church secured the services of Mr. White, an English Baptist minister, who died after a brief term of service. Screven was just considering an invitation to the pastorate of the Boston church, but was constrained to resume his work in Charleston. He died at his Georgetown home, October 10, 1713, at the advanced age of eighty-four. He left the church a strong body, with a membership of nearly a hundred. A large number of preaching-stations had been established, and the negro population, already becoming relatively large, had doubtless already been brought to a considerable extent under the influence of the gospel.

The population of the province had increased to about fifteen thousand, of whom rather more than half were slaves. The fresh and fertile soil was yielding rich returns to the application of slave labor, lumber was abundant and marketable, the sea abounded in valuable fish, and commercial prosperity gladdened the hearts of the colo-

nists. Culture and refinement went hand in hand with abundance and leisure, and the foundations were being laid for the brilliant political and religious history of the succeeding time, and also, alas! for more recent disasters.

Little beyond his name is known of Sanford, Screven's successor. Dying about 1718 he was succeeded by William Peartt. During his ten years' pastorate the work of church extension was carried forward with vigor, and meeting-houses were built on Edisto Island, on the Ashley River above Charleston, and on Stono, sixteen miles from the city (Manly, "Two Centuries," p. 94). He married the widow of Paul Grimball, a noted Baptist who had been secretary to the prince, and a member of Governor Archdale's council. This lady was married a third time and (as Mrs. Smith) left a legacy of £1540 to the Philadelphia Baptist church. Thomas Simmons, an Englishman who had been ordained in Pennsylvania, was the next pastor. Under him troubles began, and what had been a united and prosperous church was so rent asunder by factions that by 1746 Morgan Edwards found only three, "one man and two women," "that might be called a church." In 1733 a schism occurred resulting in the organization of a General Baptist church. They secured as pastor a Mr. Ingram from England, and worshiped at Stono, where a meeting-house had been erected some time before. In the same year Isaac Chanler, an English Baptist minister, began laboring in the Ashley River community, and in 1736 the work had reached such dimensions that it was thought wise to organize a church there. This also drew heavily on the mother-church. The work on Edisto was carried on at this time with considerable success by Mr. Tilly, but no organization seems to have been effected.

One other church, which was likewise to become the

mother of churches, was constituted in South Carolina before the close of this period. In 1737 a company of Baptists from the Welsh Tract, Pa. (now Delaware), under the leadership of James James, settled on the Peedee River, where in 1738 they organized themselves into a church, afterward known as the Welsh Neck church. Philip James, a son of the leader, was ordained pastor of the church in 1743, Isaac Chanler and Thomas Simmons assisting in the ceremony. The church was organized so near the close of the period that nothing further need be here recorded.

The history of Virginia Baptists had barely a beginning in the present period. Virginia was settled by thorough-going churchmen. The Church of England was established, the support of its ministers amply provided for at the public expense; the people were compelled under severe penalties to participate regularly in the church services and to subject themselves to catechetical instruction; dissenting services of any kind were rigorously prohibited; heavy fines were imposed on ship-owners for bringing in dissenters, and the people were prohibited under heavy penalties from harboring or in any way favoring them. In 1642 three Congregational ministers from New England attempted to introduce their principles among the people, but were soon obliged to relinquish their plans and to leave the colony. About 1648 there were found to be about one hundred and eighteen dissenters in the colony, mostly Congregationalists. These were severely dealt with. The Quakers pressed in with considerable vigor from 1656 onward. The following act of the assembly (1661-62) applied equally to Baptists and Quakers, though no Baptist is known to have been in Virginia up to this date: "Whereas, Many schismatical persons, out of their aversion to the orthodox established religion,

or out of the newfangled conceits of their own heretical inventions, refuse to have their children baptized; Be it therefore enacted . . . that all persons that, in contempt of the divine sacrament of baptism, shall refuse when they may carry their child to a lawful minister in that county, to have them baptized, shall be amerced two thousand pounds of tobacco; half to the informer, half to the public."

The provisions of the English Act of Toleration of 1689 were to a great extent inoperative in Virginia for the next twenty years. From the early years of the eighteenth century there were a number of scattered Baptists in Virginia, especially in Isle of Wight County. Some of these sent an earnest petition to the General Baptists of London for ministerial help. In response two ministers, Robert Nordin and Thomas White, were sent out in 1714. The latter died before reaching Virginia; the former organized a church at Burleigh. It is possible that this and other General Baptist churches had already been gathered before the arrival of Nordin. Before 1729 there was also a church in Surrey County, in close affiliation, it would seem, with that at Burleigh. Nordin died in 1735. Two years later two more English Baptist ministers, Casper Mintz and Richard Jones, came out to carry forward the work. The church at Burleigh was in a distracted and unsettled state in 1756 and appealed to the Philadelphia Association for a visit of brethren to set things in order.

If Baptists appeared in Virginia during the latter part of the seventeenth century, as Morgan Edwards supposed, they were probably driven by the severe measures referred to across the North Carolina border. We have no record of the formation of a church in North Carolina until 1727, when an organization was effected under the leadership of Paul Palmer, who had been a member of the Welsh Tract church, and who was a correspondent of John Comer, of

Newport. From a letter written by this church to Comer in 1729, we learn that it was organized in 1727 and consisted of thirty-two members. It was located in Chowan County, at a place called Perquimans. This was the only church organized during the present period.

Four churches were organized in Connecticut during this period, under the influence of the Rhode Island General (Six Principle) Baptists—the first, at Groton in 1705, through the efforts of Valentine Wightman, of North Kingston, R. I., who became its pastor; the second, at New London in 1726, in connection with the labors of Stephen Gorton; the third, in 1735, at Wallingford, of persons who had been members of the New London church; the fourth church to be constituted, and the last during this period, was the Farmington (now Southington) church. Small bands of Baptists of the same type appeared in a number of other places.

There were Mennonites in the New Netherlands (afterward New York) as early as 1644. The Dutch colonists were of the Reformed religion and tolerated sparingly other forms of worship. The free exercise of religion was given to the Church of England in 1641, and religious freedom was granted by charter to the town of Flushing in 1645; but unacceptable forms of religion intruded themselves to such an extent as to cause alarm, and in 1656 conventicles and meetings, public and private, were “absolutely and expressly forbidden.” The penalty of preaching, reading, or singing in any “meetings differing from the customary and legal assemblies” was fixed at one hundred pounds Flemish, and the penalty of being “found in such meetings” at twenty-five pounds. Lutherans were numerous and by vigorously protesting were able to secure the right to worship in their own houses. The town of Flushing insisted on enjoying the provisions of its char-

ter, even to the extent of tolerating Quakers. These special privileges were withdrawn from the town by special ordinance in 1658.

In 1643 Lady Moody, who had adopted antipedobaptist views, left Massachusetts, with a number of her friends and dependents, for Long Island. On her way she spent some time in New Haven, where she is said to have made several converts to her views, among them Mrs. Eaton, the wife of the first governor of the New Haven colony, and the daughter of an English bishop. Mrs. Eaton gave much trouble to Pastor John Davenport, who labored earnestly to convince her that "baptism has come in the place of circumcision, and is to be administered unto infants." Lady Moody took a patent of land from Governor Kieft at Gravesend, with the guaranty of "the free liberty of conscience according to the custom of Holland, without molestation or disturbance from any magistrate or magistrates, or any other ecclesiastical minister that may pretend jurisdiction over them." A number of other antipedobaptists from New England and elsewhere gathered themselves around Lady Moody, but they do not seem at this time to have formed themselves into a church. Francis Doughty, an English antipedobaptist, having incurred persecution at Lynn and Taunton, Mass., for denying infant baptism, was the first religious teacher in Flushing. After laboring for a short period he left for Virginia in 1656. A paper on "The State of Religion" in the New Netherlands, drawn up by two Reformed clergymen (Megapolensis and Drissius) in August, 1657, and addressed to the classis of Amsterdam, gives a number of interesting facts with reference to Long Island at this time, which partly confirm and partly contradict some of the data derived from other sources. Mennonites are mentioned as being at Gravesend, who "reject infant baptism, the Sabbath, the office of preacher,

and the teachers of God's word, saying that through these have come all sorts of contention into the world. Whenever they come together the one or the other reads something for them." These so-called Mennonites were probably identical with Lady Moody and her followers, and these peculiarities may account for the failure of these antipedobaptists to organize a regular Baptist church. The notice about Flushing is highly interesting: "At Flushing they have had a Presbyterian preacher who conformed to our Church, but many of them became endowed with divers opinions. . . . They absented themselves from preaching, nor would they pay the preacher his promised stipend. The said preacher was obliged to leave and repair to the English Virginias." This preacher can scarcely be other than Francis Doughty, whose antipedobaptist views seem abundantly attested. The document continues: "Last year [1656] a fomentor of evil came there. He was a cobbler from Rhode Island . . . and stated that he was commissioned by Christ. He began to preach at Flushing, and then went with the people into the river and dipped them. This becoming known here, the constable proceeded thither and brought him along. He was banished the province." According to the contemporary public records this "cobbler" was none other than the distinguished William Wickenden, pastor of the Providence church. In November, 1656, William Hallett, sheriff of Flushing, was arraigned before the authorities for having "dared to collect conventicles in his house, and to permit one William Wickendam [Wickenden] to explain and comment on God's Holy Word, and to administer sacraments, though not called thereto by any civil or clerical authority"; also for having assisted at such meetings, and "accepted from the said Wickendam's hands the bread in the form and manner the Lord's Supper is

usually celebrated." Hallett was deprived of his office and fined fifty pounds. Wickenden was fined one hundred pounds and banished. He was sentenced to "remain a prisoner till the fine and cost of the process shall be paid." When it was ascertained that he was too poor to pay the fine he was allowed to depart, with the threat of imprisonment till fine and costs should be paid in case he should return.

A still more stringent ordinance was enacted in 1662, providing for a fine of fifty guldens for being present at an unauthorized religious meeting, with a doubling of the fine for the second offense, a quadrupling for the third, "and arbitrary punishment besides." The stringency of the law would seem to indicate that the evils forefended were becoming alarming.

About 1711 Nicholas Eyres, a well-educated brewer of New York, invited Valentine Wightman, of Groton, Conn., one of the most noted General Baptist ministers of the time, to New York, and opened his house on Broad Street for religious services. Wightman seems for years to have visited the city from time to time. In 1714 Eyres and a number of others were baptized by Wightman. It was the advice of some that the baptismal service should be private for fear of the mob; but Eyres insisted that it should be public, referring to the New Testament words: "No man doeth anything in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly." He waited on Governor Burnet (son of the famous bishop) and asked for police protection. This was cheerfully granted. The governor graced the occasion with his presence and is said to have remarked after the baptismal service was over: "This was the ancient manner of baptizing, and is, in my opinion, much preferable to the practice of modern times." In 1715 Eyres's house was licensed as a Baptist

meeting-house. In 1720 he hired a separate meeting-house and in 1721 received a permit to preach, under the Toleration Act, from Governor Burnet, which begins: "Whereas, Mr. Nich. Eyres, brewer, a freeman, and inhabitant of the City of New York, pretending to be at present a teacher or preacher of a congregation of Anabaptists, which has had its beginning about five years ago within this city and has so continued hitherto." The recognition of the church and the ordination of the pastor seem not to have taken place till 1724, when Valentine Wightman, of Groton, and Daniel Wightman, of Newport, visited New York for these purposes. In 1728 a lot was purchased and a meeting-house erected. Considerable aid was received from the Rhode Island Baptists, but a crushing debt was incurred. This, combined with doctrinal disharmony, almost wrecked the church in 1730. According to Eyres, who left New York in 1731 to become joint pastor with Wightman of the Six Principle church of Newport, "some of them deserted under a pretense of love to the principles of absolute election and predestination." The church languished and became extinct before the close of the period.

About sixteen Baptist families settled on Block Island in 1663 and without formal organization maintained religious services until 1772, when a Baptist church was organized, the only church that has ever existed on the island.

About 1700 William Rhodes, a Baptist minister, appeared at Oyster Bay, Long Island, and a number were converted through his ministry and probably baptized by him. Some time afterward (the date does not appear to be ascertainable) a church was organized with the aid of elders from Rhode Island (probably General Baptists), and in 1724 Robert Feeks, a member of the church, was*ordained as its pastor.

PERIOD II.

FROM THE GREAT AWAKENING TO THE
ORGANIZATION OF THE TRIENNIAL
CONVENTION (1740-1814).

CHAPTER I.

NEW ENGLAND.¹

THE preceding period closed with Baptist churches somewhat firmly rooted in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and South Carolina, and with feeble churches in Connecticut, New York, Virginia, and North Carolina. While the first Baptist churches of America were strongly Calvinistic, Arminianism had proved far more popular. The First Church of Providence soon became Arminian, and Arminian Baptist churches multiplied in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. The first Baptist church of South Carolina had been almost wrecked by Arminianism. In Virginia, North Carolina, and New York the Arminian type of teaching prevailed. The First Church of Boston was considerably shaken by Arminianism about 1740. Calvinism had secured almost undisputed control in the churches of the Philadelphia Association, and the vigor of religious and denominational life in these churches augured well for the future predominance of this type of Baptist teaching.

The rapid spread of a Socinianized Arminianism was by no means confined to the Baptists nor to America. In England a cold intellectualism was becoming widely prev-

¹ See Backus, "Hist." and "Tracts"; Hovey; Guild, "Chaplain Smith" and "James Manning"; Callender; Comer; Jonathan Edwards; Tracy; Trumbull; Denison; Chauncy; Whitefield, "Journals"; Stewart, "Free-Will Baptists," vol. i.; "Cent. Rec. Fr.-W. Baptists"; Asplund; Benedict; True; and Barrows.

alent alike in the established church and in the dissenting denominations. The Presbyterians of England were preparing to transfer their membership, buildings, and endowments to Unitarianism. The General Baptist churches had dwindled under the blighting influence of Socinianism till those who could by any stretch of charity be regarded as confessing the deity of Christ numbered only a few hundreds; while the evangelistic zeal of the English Particular Baptists had given place to a type of hyper-Calvinism that looked upon evangelistic effort as an impertinence.

In New England the decline in religious zeal and in the average purity of religious life had from the middle of the seventeenth century been rapid and general. The Half-way Covenant of 1662, which relaxed the rigorous restriction of church and civil privileges to the regenerate by admitting to baptism the children of moral and orthodox persons who laid no claim to personal regeneration, was symptomatic of the decline of religious zeal and fervor, and promoted still further decline. In a great majority of the churches of the standing order the owning of the covenant became a mere formality, and all the privileges of church-membership were thrown open to those who made no profession of conversion. Under such circumstances it was natural that experimental religion should be greatly neglected. The lowering of the standard of full church-membership inevitably resulted in the lowering of the standard of admission to the ministry. Far greater stress came to be laid upon intellectual training than upon a personal experience of divine grace, and if to suitable education doctrinal soundness and a life free from scandal were added, no question was likely to be raised as to the fitness of the candidate for ordination. Many good men of the standing order bewailed the secularization of the churches and sought in vain for remedies. Among other

devices was the attempt to introduce a Presbyterian discipline. Increase Mather declared (about 1705) that "the Congregational church discipline is not suited for a worldly interest, or for a formal generation of professors. It will stand or fall as godliness in the power of it does prevail or otherwise." With almost prophetic insight he added: "If the begun apostasy should proceed as fast the next thirty years as it has done these last, surely it will come to pass in New England (except the Gospel itself depart with the order of it) that the most conscientious people therein will think themselves concerned to gather churches out of churches." The begun apostasy continued, and in something less than fifty years the process of gathering churches out of churches was going rapidly forward.

It does not fall within the scope of the present work to give a full account of the Great Awakening in New England and the similar movement in England, commonly designated the Evangelical Revival, led in America by Whitefield, Edwards, the Tennents, and others, and in England by the Wesleys, Whitefield, and others. The revival may be said to have begun in America in connection with Jonathan Edwards's labors as pastor of the church at Northampton, Mass., in 1734. For years this community was in such a state of religious fervor and activity that scarcely an individual escaped the influence of Christian teaching and large numbers experienced inner renewing. From Northampton the movement spread rapidly throughout New England. At about the same time Gilbert Tennent began to agitate in the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia for the requirement of evidences of experimental religion in candidates for the ministry. In 1727, William Tennent, his father, had founded the "Log College" for the education of ministers, and had by this

time impressed with evangelistic zeal a large body of young men. The controversy as to the relative stress that should be laid on vital godliness and on education in candidates for the ministry cannot here be followed up. But those who gathered themselves around the Tennents, and who laid chief stress on vital godliness, were able, notwithstanding much bitter opposition, to stir the religious life of the middle colonies to its depths.

Whitefield began his American evangelistic labors in the South (1637), and extended them to the middle and New England colonies (1740-41, etc.), preaching with marvelous frequency¹ and with irresistible power to immense audiences. Whitefield's New England tour was followed by a like visit from Gilbert Tennent in 1741. Side by side with these great evangelists a large number of highly gifted and enthusiastic men were soon engaged in bringing the gospel message to bear upon the masses of the people throughout the colonies. Scarcely a community wholly escaped the influence of the revival. There are few instances in history of transformations of religious life so profound and so widespread during so short a period. The revival probably reached its climax about 1741, but for many years afterward the work was carried forward with zeal and success. The prevailing type of preaching that underlay the revival was Calvinistic. No point in the Christian system was more dwelt upon than the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit.

Arminianism in insidious forms had so increased by the beginning of the revival as to cause alarm to the maintainers of the old orthodoxy. Edwards relates that in the early stages of the revival at Northampton this was one of the influences that led men to seek salvation. It was feared

¹ He preached one hundred and seventy-five times in seventy-five days in 1740.

that with the spread of Arminianism the Spirit of God would be withdrawn from the land, and that the opportunity for securing salvation would be past. No doubt Edwards himself encouraged this view. It may be readily conceived that this extraordinary awakening was not accomplished without arousing the sharpest antagonism on the part of ministers and others who had become imbued with Socinian ideas, and who regarded any manifestation of enthusiasm in connection with religion as savoring of fanaticism.

The New England Baptists, as a rule, held aloof from the revival movement during its early stages. This was due to the fact that the great majority of their churches were Arminian and could not sympathize with the Calvinistic character of the movement; and partly to the fact that having been so unkindly treated by the standing order they felt a natural antipathy to entering into intimate relations with its members and ministers.

The controversies between the New Lights, as the revival party came to be called, and the opponents of the revival were prolonged and bitter. It will not be practicable to enter into the details of the controversies and of the legal enactments against the New Lights. In many of the churches the pastor and a majority of the members opposed the revival and refused to admit the revival preachers, while a minority were enthusiastic New Lights and regarded this opposition as a fighting against God. Denunciatory language on both sides generally resulted in the withdrawal of the New Lights and the organization of churches of the regenerate.

The opponents of the revival objected strongly to lay evangelization, which became a prominent feature of the New Light movement, and to the unauthorized invasion of parishes by itinerant preachers. The New Lights, it

need scarcely be said, were not always blameless in their treatment of the opposing party. They sometimes undertook, in an uncharitable spirit, to sit in judgment on those who refused to fall into line with their work. They had a definite idea of the kind of religious experience that each individual should have, and they were loath to recognize any one as truly converted who had not experienced a large measure of emotional excitement. Yet with all their extravagances the New Lights unquestionably stood for vital godliness and aggressive Christianity, while those who opposed them put themselves in the path of a great work of reformation and prepared the way for the Unitarian defection of the later time.

Strenuous laws were enacted in Connecticut against the formation of churches without the permission of the authorities and against unauthorized preaching. A number of godly ministers were imprisoned, fined, and expelled from the country; and members of New Light churches were taxed for the support of the standing churches and imprisoned for refusing to pay. Unauthorized schools and colleges were prohibited, and only university graduates were allowed to receive support under the laws. A number of students were expelled from Yale College in 1744 for favoring the New Light party. The president of Harvard College, who in 1741 had commended Whitefield and Tennent as "pious and valuable men of God," "greatly instrumental in the hand of God to revive this blessed work," joined with his colleagues in 1745, on the occasion of Whitefield's second tour in New England, in publishing a declaration against him. Whitefield had set the example of denouncing the unconverted ministers who opposed the revival, and was held responsible for the strife and schism that had by this time become alarming.

As these Separate churches made unregenerate church-

membership one of the chief points of their protest, it might have been expected that the incompatibility of this position with the retention of infant baptism would soon become evident. Of the thirty-one ministers who were ordained as pastors of Separate churches from 1646 to 1651, five were Baptists before they were ordained and eight became Baptists soon afterward. Among the latter was Isaac Backus, who was to become the most important Baptist leader and polemicist of the period.

In 1745 a Separate church was formed at Mansfield, Conn., amid much persecution. A number of antipedobaptists were among the constituent members. In their covenant it is stated: "Though most of us agree in the article of infant baptism, yet a difference in that particular doth not break the spiritual communion of saints; therefore it is no just bar to our covenanting and partaking of the ordinances together, wherein we are agreed." It is probable that Baptists soon appeared in all or nearly all of the Separate societies, and it was fondly hoped that the New Light bond would suffice to hold pedobaptists and antipedobaptists together in fellowship and peace; but it is in the nature of antipedobaptist convictions to grow stronger and stronger with time and reflection, and those who became convinced that infant baptism was not only non-Scriptural, but a lamentable perversion of Scripture teaching, soon came to feel that a serious compromise of principle was involved in their continuance in fellowship with those who were involved in this error. The first large accession to the Baptist ranks from this source occurred at Sturbridge, Mass. (June, 1749), when Elder Moulton baptized thirteen members of the Separate church, including a deacon. The pastor, John Blunt, all the remaining officers, and most of the members, amounting to over sixty, soon followed. In the words of one who par-

ticipated in this movement, "Infant sprinkling, which we called baptism, went away like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor." Having baptized nearly a hundred believers, Blunt had by 1753 abandoned his antipedobaptist views and was seeking to restore the practice of infant baptism in the church. The church admonished him and called a council of Separate churches, which sustained its admonition and declared that the pastor had broken covenant. Although the members of the church made diligent efforts to avail themselves of the exemption afforded by the law to Baptist churches, they were taxed for two years to support the standing order, and such as refused to pay had their goods seized and sacrificed or were thrown into prison. They finally appealed to the Superior Court, which decided in their favor.

Irritated by the increase of the Baptists and their firmness in maintaining their rights, the legislature, in 1752, amended the exemption law so as to make it far more burdensome. It was enacted that the certificates of members should be signed by the minister with two principal members of the Baptist church, and that no minister or church should have power to give lawful certificates until they should have secured "from three other churches, commonly called Anabaptist, a certificate from each respectively, that they esteem such church to be of their denomination, and that they conscientiously believe them to be Anabaptists." As the Separate churches were not at first in communion with the older Baptist churches, and as Baptist churches were not numerous, it was by no means easy to secure such certificates; while the requirement that they should have themselves certificated as "Anabaptists" involved an insult of the gravest character. A woman named Esther White was imprisoned at Taunton from February, 1752, till March, 1753, for refusing to pay

a clerical tax of eightpence. She soon afterward became a Baptist. A Separate church at Framingham, organized in 1747, formed the nucleus of a Baptist church, which, however, was not constituted until many years later.

At Norwich, Conn., the mother of Isaac Backus and several other members of the Separate church were imprisoned for refusal to pay clerical taxes. "But," writes Backus himself, who was in the midst of this great conflict, "the more they oppressed them the more they grew." The Separate congregation soon doubled.

The case of Isaac Backus is one of extraordinary interest and must be narrated at some length. It well illustrates the working out of the principles involved in this movement. Born in 1724, of ancestry that represented what was best in the Congregational life of Connecticut, he was brought to a saving knowledge of the truth in connection with revival meetings held in his native town in 1741. Owing to his excellent religious education he did not experience so great a degree of emotional excitement as did many of his contemporaries. In 1742 he united with the church of his fathers and remained a member for two years. But the decision of the church "to admit communicants by a major vote, without giving the church so much as a written relation of any inward change"; the disposition of the pastor to regard the Supper as a converting ordinance, and his "strong affection for the Saybrook scheme," which embodied some of the most objectionable features of state-church Presbyterianism and which the church had rejected under the influence of Joseph Backus, his grandfather; and the persecution of New Lights in various parts of the country, led him, along with twenty-nine other male members and a large number of females, to withdraw and form a Separate church. Among the Separates were one deacon and a

number of the wealthiest and most influential people of the town. They soon came to outnumber the original church, but by a strange perversion of justice they were taxed and distressed for the support of its pastor. During a single year as many as forty persons, including a number of women, were imprisoned. The main points of contention on the part of the Separates were the restriction of the Supper to the regenerate, the application of church discipline so as to secure churches of the regenerate, and the independence of the local church, with the right to call and ordain its own officers.

As a result of a revival in Titicut, near Middleborough, Mass., the New Lights had withdrawn from the established church in December, 1747. Backus, who had shortly before decided to give himself to the gospel ministry, happened a few days afterward to pass that way and was "prevailed with to tarry and preach among them." The "precinct committee" urged him to take steps for becoming the legal pastor of the church, but he had become convinced of the iniquity of any union of church and state. A revival resulted in about twenty conversions. A church was formed in February following, "which increased to threescore in ten months." Backus and his flock were taxed and harassed, but they were resolved, come what might, to adhere to their principles.

Disputes about baptism were introduced into the Titicut church in August, 1749. Backus was brought suddenly to feel "that the Baptist way is certainly right, because nature fights so against it. And he was hurried on to preach it up the next day; which caused confusion among the hearers, and returned with a horrible gloom over his own mind; and he was turned back to his former practice." In September, during his absence in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, where he seems to have been seeking con-

firmation in his pedobaptist views, Elder Moulton had visited his people "and had plunged some of them"—nine, as Backus elsewhere mentions. These had been offended by Backus's return to the advocacy of infant baptism, and now withdrew from the church and inaugurated a meeting of their own. Backus was no doubt greatly annoyed. He expressed his sorrow for preaching against infant baptism, and declared that he was willing to venture into eternity on that practice. But anxiety soon returned. He was led a few months later to inquire, "Where is it, and in what relation to the church do those stand who are baptized but not converted?" A body of fanatical New Lights in Easton and Norton, Mass., had just adopted believers' baptism, and had proceeded in an unseemly way to baptize one another and had otherwise acted in a disorderly manner. The natural tendency of these facts would have been to deter Backus from reopening the question. But he finally determined to "leave good men and bad men out of the question, and inquire, *What saith the Scripture?*" Hereby a settlement was granted, and he was baptized August 22, 1751, "along with six members" of his church, by Elder Benjamin Pierce, of Warwick. This step involved deep humiliation; but the voice of conscience had become imperative. Lamentable discord naturally attended these events. A council of New Light churches was called (October, 1751). Sixteen were found, of whom three were Baptists, "willing to renew their covenant and go on together." These were recognized as the church and the rest were censured. Backus was censured and excommunicated, but was restored to fellowship and the pastorate in November following. Two of the sixteen insisted that Backus should baptize infants, and on his refusal broke off communion with the church. They were finally censured and excommunicated. In the

meantime five Baptists refused communion and were censured. A council was called (November, 1752) in the interest of the two excommunicated pedobaptists, consisting of three of the churches of the former council. The two brethren were justified, and the majority, including the pastor, censured. A general meeting of New Light churches, in which twenty-seven congregations were represented, was held at Exeter (May, 1753) to adjust the difficulties of the Titicut church and to determine the policy to be pursued in like controversies already imminent elsewhere. It was "unanimously agreed that a turning to or from infant baptism was not a censurable evil; but that each should leave the other with God, according to Phil. iii. 15." The meeting arranged for a council to meet at Middleborough in July for the harmonizing of the contending elements in the church. The censures of the pedobaptist and the Baptist members were revoked and the church was again received into fellowship.

Solomon Paine, one of the leading Separate ministers, had refused to take part in the Exeter meeting. This was regarded as a grievance by Stephen Babcock, a leading antipedobaptist Separate minister, who, moreover, criticised Paine's attitude toward the Baptists in the *ex-parte* council of November, 1752. This irritation led to the calling of a meeting of representatives of all the Separate churches. The meeting was held at Stonington in May, 1754. Forty churches were represented. The result was even less satisfactory to the Baptists, a majority having pronounced in favor of the decision of the *ex-parte* council of November, 1752. Pedobaptist leaders like Paine began to express the opinion that while those who confessed themselves to be in darkness with reference to infant baptism were to be tolerated, those who had reached the conviction that it was wrong should be censured. It began

to be evident to Baptists and pedobaptists alike that a breach was inevitable. So thorough was the agreement of Baptist and pedobaptist Separates in their views of doctrine and life, and so closely had they been united through their common sufferings on behalf of a converted ministry and membership, that they regarded a sundering of communion as a calamity. The fact that it would weaken the cause in the face of bitter opposition was manifest to all.

Backus and his church attempted to follow the policy of mutual toleration of each other's views for or against infant baptism. "But when some pious members manifested a belief of duty to be buried in baptism, others refused to go to the water to see it done, because, in their view, they were already baptized, and to repeat it would be taking the sacred name in vain. And when an elder came and sprinkled some infants, the Baptists felt a like difficulty, though they did not leave the meeting where it was done. Being unwilling to part, attempts were made to convince each other, which led into warm debates. . . . Thus edification, the great end of Christian society, was marred instead of being promoted, by that which is called large communion. It was so far from answering to that name, that, with their utmost endeavors, the author [Backus] and his brethren could never arrive at communion in the ordinance of the Supper, from September, 1754, to the end of 1755." By the beginning of 1756 Backus and a number of his brethren became convinced "that truth limits church communion to believers, baptized upon a profession of their own faith." On January 16, 1756, with the assistance of representatives of the Boston and Rehoboth churches, a Baptist church was organized at Middleborough, of which Backus was to remain pastor for fifty years.

Backus was abundant in labors. The doctrines of the Separates in general and of the Baptists in particular continued to be bitterly attacked. He was the chief Baptist champion of these principles, and his polemical tracts constitute a noble body of writings. His defense of the peculiar principles of the Baptists was as able as any that the eighteenth century afforded. He wrote much in behalf of liberty of conscience and against the support of the ministry by taxation. He was ever on the alert to protest against anything that savored of persecution, and no man did more during the latter half of the eighteenth century for the promotion of civil and religious liberty in New England. His services in agitating for the abolition of the unjust ecclesiastical laws of Massachusetts will be considered in another chapter. He was among the foremost of the Baptists in seeing the need of an educated ministry, and was a warm friend of Rhode Island College.

A second Baptist church was organized in Middleborough in 1758 and a third in 1761, both at a considerable distance from the first, and Baptist principles were profoundly impressed upon the community. During his entire ministry Backus traveled much in the interest of the cause throughout the New England States, and the rapid growth of the denomination was due, in a considerable measure, to his influence. He spent much time during his later years in collecting and arranging materials for a history of the Baptists in New England, and the denomination is deeply indebted to him for the invaluable service that he rendered in this direction.

Wise in counsel, fervent in evangelistic zeal, systematic and industrious in his pastoral and in his literary work, ever on the alert to defend his denomination from unjust attacks, charitable toward his opponents and toward all, he finished his course with joy in November, 1806, having

lived eighty-two years and ten months, and having served in the gospel ministry over sixty years.

It will be interesting to glance at the history of the older New England churches during this period. The First Church in Providence had become Arminian, and had, in 1652, made the laying on of hands a condition of communion. Controversy in 1731-32 had resulted in the triumph of an extreme party which made communion, even in prayer, with those who had not passed under hands a matter of discipline, and which held that "all those who took anything for preaching were like Simon Magus." The leader of this party was Samuel Winsor. He was opposed by Governor Jenckes, James Brown, and others. The church was divided, but Winsor became the pastor of the principal part in 1732. He continued in office until his death, in 1758, and was succeeded by his son, who did little for the advancement of the cause. The church had degenerated into a narrow sectarianism that caused it to hold rigorously aloof from the great revival movement, and during these years was more dead than alive. The opening of Rhode Island College in Providence, with James Manning as president, in 1770, marks the beginning of a new era in the history of this unfortunate church. Manning was born in Elizabethtown, N. J., October 22, 1738. In 1762 he had been graduated from Princeton College, and in the following year he had been ordained by the Elizabethtown church as an itinerant minister. He had been selected by his brethren of the Philadelphia Association to lead in founding a Baptist educational institution in Rhode Island. It was decided to begin work at Warren, where a generous support was offered him by a band of Baptists whose membership was in the Swansea church. Thither he went in the summer of 1764, and in October a church was organized, which prospered under his minis-

try. The college and its president removed to Providence in 1770. He was from time to time invited by the church to preach, and joined with its members in the breaking of bread. This was contrary to the principles of Elder Winsor and some others, as it had come to be known that Manning did not consider the laying on of hands obligatory, and that he favored congregational singing. A large majority of the church desired his services, and when Winsor and his adherents had withdrawn and formed a separate congregation (1771), Manning was invited to preach regularly and to administer the ordinances. Backus informs us that "though his powers of mind and human accomplishments were very great, yet he used great plainness of speech, and was as easily understood by the common people as almost any preacher in the land. And few men ever prized the special influence of the Spirit of God in preaching, more than he did." A visit to the Philadelphia Association in 1774, where he heard the unlearned but eloquent and zealous Daniel Fristoe, of Virginia, kindled afresh his zeal and courage. Before the close of 1775 he had baptized into the Providence church one hundred and ten converts, and a number of those who had been converted in his meetings had united with the New Light church under Mr. Snow. Thus the church was brought into the front rank of Baptist churches, a position that it has held to the present time. A meeting-house costing about £7000 was erected in 1775, one of the purposes specified being "to hold commencement in." A Charitable Society was organized in 1774 and was chartered by the General Assembly. The value of so well organized and efficient a church, under a model leader like Manning, at the educational center of the denomination, cannot be overestimated. Manning never considered himself pastor of the church, but served it with considerable

regularity till 1786 and occasionally afterward. Under Stephen Gano, a nephew of President Manning, who served the church from 1792 till his death in 1828, the prosperity of the church was continued, one hundred and sixty-five members having been added as a result of a revival near the beginning of his ministry.

There is less of interest in the history of the First Church of Newport during this period. Callender continued pastor till his death in 1748. Unfortunately, he strongly opposed the revival, regarding Whitefield as a second George Fox. The church seems to have enjoyed no extensive work of grace till the present century. Probably the ablest pastor after Callender was Benjamin Foster, a graduate of Yale in 1774. While in college he was appointed to defend infant baptism in a public debate. The result of his industrious search for arguments was a failure to find any that satisfied him. He studied theology under Samuel Stillman, of Boston, and became one of the ablest theologians that the denomination possessed. His stay in Newport was brief (1785-88). His acceptance of a call to New York was strongly opposed by the church. Like some other of the older churches, this church for some time held aloof from the Warren Association (organized in 1767), and having afterward united with it subsequently withdrew. This attitude of the church may have been due, on the one hand, to extreme regard for church independency, and, on the other, to imperfect sympathy with the New Light Baptists, who were leaders in this and every other aggressive and progressive measure.

It may be interesting to note that this church was one of the first to introduce instrumental music. The instrument was a bass viol and caused considerable commotion. This occurred early in the present century.

The First Baptist Church of Boston was also, unfortu-

nately, on the wrong side in relation to the revival. The pastor, Jeremy Condry (1739-65), was a Harvard graduate and a pronounced Arminian. He claimed, in 1742, that even if he should preach election it would offend the majority of the church. This fact, together with the opposition of the pastor and a majority of the members to the revival, led to the withdrawal of a number of the most zealous and progressive members and the organization of a second church, Calvinistic in doctrine and sympathetic with the New Light movement. The disaffected element sent to the church a somewhat elaborate statement of the grounds of their dissatisfaction and of the terms on which they would remain in the church. They represent the pastor as holding general redemption, being a free-willer, holding to falling from grace, and denying original sin. "We mean by his denying original sin, that he softens, moderates, and explains away the guilt, malignity, corruption, and depravity of human nature exactly as the high Arminian clergy forever do. . . . Whenever we have heard him discourse on the new birth, his sermons were so ill grounded, so intermixed with man's free-will agency, and so widely different from what our Lord taught and intended thereby, that we cannot avoid questioning whether he ever experienced the saving operation of that most important doctrine in his own soul. We were sufficiently affrighted at a declaration in one of his sermons, that Christians cannot know or distinguish the operation of the Spirit of God upon their souls from the operation of their own minds. This assertion we look upon to be of the most dangerous tendency." The First Church remained in a languishing condition until Samuel Stillman became pastor, in 1765. Stillman was a native of Philadelphia (born 1737). He had received a good classical education, and had been trained for the ministry by Oliver Hart,

pastor of the First Baptist Church of Charleston, S. C. He was ordained as an evangelist by this church in 1759. He was one of the most amiable, eloquent, and useful ministers of his time. For forty years he ministered in Boston, and it is said that no stranger visiting the city failed to hear him. A revival began in 1769, and in three years eighty members were added, more than doubling the membership. The church was much scattered during the war, but in 1785 the pastor returned to his post, and through revivals in this year and in 1790 large numbers were added.

The leaders in the Second Church (organized in 1743) were James Bound, John Dabney, Thomas Boucher, and John Proctor. Ephraim Bound, then a young man, became pastor. There was considerable difficulty in making arrangements for his ordination, as most of the Baptist churches were opposed to the revival. It was decided to seek the assistance of Elder Valentine Wightman, of Groton, Conn., who, though he had been for many years affiliated with the General (Six Principle) Baptists, had entered heartily into the revival movement and was understood to hold to the doctrines of grace. It is interesting to note that Dr. John Gill, the famous English Baptist divine, sent the new church a communion service, baptismal robes, and a number of books. The church prospered under the ministry of Bound until the pastor was stricken by paralysis in 1762, when it had reached a membership of one hundred and twenty.

The Swansea and Rehoboth churches held resolutely aloof from the New Light movement and for years would enter into no relations with the Separate Baptists. In 1754 some Baptist ministers from New Jersey visited them and sought, with some effect, to remove their prejudices against their New Light brethren. It was not until 1771 that these churches threw off their lethargy and entered heartily into

the revival movement. Several hundred were added to the churches at this time. An even greater work of grace covered these communities in 1780, when singing was introduced into the Second Swansea Church. As a result of the great ingathering of 1771, and the close sympathy into which the Baptists were brought with their pedobaptist New Light brethren, a church was formed in Rehoboth under the leadership of Jacob Hicks, which held that baptism by immersion ought not to be made a term of communion. By the close of the century the practice of this church had come into substantial harmony with that of the Baptist churches in general.

Under the influence of a baptized evangelist named Elhanan Winchester, members of a Separate Congregational church in Rehoboth formed an open-communion society in 1771. Winchester was ordained as pastor, but soon afterward became convinced of the inconsistency of the position he had assumed, and declared that he could no more administer the Supper to any who were only sprinkled in infancy. The church censured and dismissed him. It was nearly extinct at the close of the last century. Winchester became a chief leader in the Universalist movement. A third open-communion church was formed on the north border of Rehoboth in 1777. This also had grown very feeble within twenty years of its organization. These are by no means all of the Baptist churches that were constituted in Swansea and Rehoboth during this period. The tendency to disunion on matters of minor importance was more marked here than elsewhere. This may have been due to the fact that the community never enjoyed the services of a great Baptist leader.

The Haverhill, Mass., church deserves to be specially mentioned on account of the distinguished services of its founder and pastor, the influential position that it came to

occupy as one of the most progressive churches in the denomination, and the completeness with which it illustrates the sufferings and the triumphs of Baptists during this period. Hezekiah Smith was born in Hampstead, L. I., April, 1737. In 1756 he was baptized into the fellowship of the Morristown, N. J., church by John Gano, who was to become one of the most distinguished ministers of his time. After preparatory studies at the Hopewell (Baptist) Academy, he pursued a full course of study at Princeton, where, along with James Manning, he was graduated in September, 1762. Shortly after his graduation he started southward on an evangelistic tour, preaching in all the intervening colonies with great acceptance and success, and for some time making Charleston, S. C., his headquarters. He became a member of the Charleston church and by it was ordained to the work of the ministry (September, 1763). The decision of Manning to engage in educational work in Rhode Island seems to have determined him, providence favoring, to make New England the center of his evangelistic labors. After visiting and preaching in a number of communities, including Boston, where he formed the acquaintance of Stillman, who also had within a few months come from South Carolina, he visited several townships on the Merrimac, including Haverhill. Most of the ministers of this region had opposed the revival, and the New Light doctrine had made little impression. A bitter controversy had occurred in the West Parish of Haverhill between the pastor and his people, and had resulted in his exclusion from the meeting-house and finally in his dismissal. For years the church had been pastorless, and the meeting-house was gladly thrown open to the eloquent evangelist. Here he preached for several months, and evangelized meanwhile through several neighboring townships. He did not proclaim himself

a Baptist until such pressure was brought to bear upon him to induce him to accept the vacant pastorate that he felt compelled to explain his position. The effect of this declaration was to cool the ardor of his pedobaptist admirers and to arouse a bitterness of opposition that has few parallels even in Massachusetts. But a considerable number, including some of the wealthiest and most influential members of the community, accepted his views of baptism and entreated him to remain and lead in the founding of a Baptist church. He continued to labor and soon began to baptize; but even after a generous salary had been voted him he hesitated for many months to accept the pastorate. The church was organized in May, 1665, and in less than three years had one hundred members. Every precaution was taken to secure for the members the exemption that the law afforded. In company with representatives of the church, Smith made hurried visits to Boston, Warren, and Middleborough soon after the organization of the church, to secure from the Baptist pastors the certificates that the new church was "Anabaptist," and having succeeded lost no time in furnishing individual certificates to those of the "Anabaptist persuasion," signed by himself and "two principal members of the church." For years the church suffered greatly from the unfriendliness of the local authorities, who made it as difficult as possible for Baptists to avail themselves of the exemption law.

During Smith's pastorate of forty-one years his labors were abundant not only in the community immediately surrounding his church, but throughout the colonies. He took the deepest interest in Rhode Island College, and spent on one occasion eight months in the South, without compensation, in raising funds for its equipment. As a member of its board he had a large share in shaping its policy. During the war of independence he served for

seven years as brigade chaplain. He entered into the colonial cause with great enthusiasm and was at the same time active as a minister of the gospel and as a counselor of some of the leaders in the struggle. He was one of the leading spirits in the organization (1767) and the development of the Warren Association. Smith took his place side by side with Backus, Manning, and Stillman in well-directed efforts to secure the repeal of the assessment laws and the abolition of the parish system. He was the foremost Baptist evangelist of the time and he was instrumental in the conversion of thousands.

The founding of Brown University was an event of primary importance in the history of American Baptists and meant much for the future standing and influence of the denomination. The idea of founding such an institution in Rhode Island seems to have originated with Morgan Edwards, of Philadelphia, who in 1762 brought the matter before the Philadelphia Association. James Manning, a recent graduate of Princeton, a man of brilliant parts and sterling worth, was encouraged in 1763 to visit Newport, confer with brethren there, and take such measures as might seem prudent for securing a charter and establishing a college. In July, 1763, he visited Newport and conferred with Hon. Samuel Ward, Colonel John Gardner, Colonel Job Bennet, Hon. Josias Lyndon, and other leading Baptists, who heartily approved of the plan. Steps were immediately taken for securing a charter. Dr. Ezra Stiles, a learned Congregational minister, afterward president of Yale College, was asked to make a draft of a charter. He inserted provisions more favorable to Presbyterians than the Baptists had intended, and left the predominance of Baptist influence insecure. The charter thus framed was about to pass the Assembly, but this was prevented by the energetic action of Hon. Daniel Jenckes, who had de-

tected the unfavorable bearing of some of its provisions on Baptist interests. Considerable commotion was caused by the discovery of the character of Dr. Stiles's work, and Baptists, somewhat ungenerously perhaps, accused him of deliberate fraud. When the Philadelphia Baptists learned of these transactions they sent Samuel Jones and R. S. Jones to Rhode Island to look after the matter. With their help and that of Nicholas Eyres, now of Newport, a charter was drafted, which passed the General Assembly in 1764. It was the intention of the projectors of the college, while vesting the ultimate control in the Baptist denomination, to give a liberal share of control to other denominations. It was intended that it should be a Christian college, in which the youth of Rhode Island and other colonies might receive advantages similar to those afforded at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, open on equal conditions to people of all denominations or of no denomination. According to the charter, twenty-two of the thirty-six trustees are to be forever Baptists; five are to be Quakers, four, Congregationalists, and five, Episcopalians. Of the twelve fellows, "eight are to be Baptists, and the rest indefinitely of any or all denominations." The following extract from the charter shows the liberal spirit in which the college was founded: "Into this liberal and catholic institution shall never be admitted any religious tests. But, on the contrary, all the members hereof shall forever enjoy full, free, absolute, and uninterrupted liberty of conscience; and that the places of professors, tutors, and all other officers, the president alone excepted, shall be free and open for all denominations of Protestants; and that youths of all religious denominations shall and may be admitted to the equal advantages, emoluments, and honors of the college or university; and that the public teaching shall, in general, respect the sciences; and that the sectarian differ-

ences shall not make any part of the public and classical instruction."

The trustees and fellows included the most prominent men of all denominations—governors, ex-governors, governors-to-be, judges, military dignitaries, etc. Among the Baptists were Samuel Ward (governor, Supreme Court justice, congressman, etc.), Chief-Justice Daniel Jenckes, Josias Lyndon (afterward governor), Nicholas Brown (a chief benefactor of the college), Colonel Job Bennet (who was made treasurer), Dr. Joshua Babcock (afterward major-general), Dr. Thomas Eyres (who was appointed secretary), Samuel Stillman, John Gano, and Morgan Edwards. Among the fellows was Hezekiah Smith, who from the beginning served the college with rare devotion.

The material resources of the college were in almost ludicrous contrast with the magnificent board of trustees. About two thousand dollars were subscribed toward its equipment, but there was no endowment, no buildings, no library, no faculty but Manning, and no salary provided for him. Morgan Edwards visited England in the interests of the college, and Hezekiah Smith made an extended canvass in the South, especially in South Carolina. It may seem strange that the dignitaries appointed as trustees did not at once make and secure from their well-to-do friends liberal contributions for the equipment of the college. But there was probably little accumulated wealth at that time and the grace of giving was not well developed.

Learning that there were a number of the members of the old Swansea church residing at Warren who were desirous of forming a new church, Manning arranged to take charge of this new interest as a means of support, and to open a Latin school that should develop into the proposed college. He began work in 1764. A year later he was appointed president of the college and began to

teach the studies of a college course to the few students who presented themselves. The first commencement was held at Warren in 1769, when seven young men, several of whom afterward attained to distinction, received the bachelor's degree.

The question of the permanent location of the college had soon to be settled. The chief competitors were Newport and Providence. Newport was twice as large and probably more than twice as wealthy as Providence, and Baptist numbers and influence were proportionately large. It is to this day a mystery to Newport people why Providence should have been chosen in preference. Providence offered £4280, which was slightly above the Newport offer; but this alone is scarcely a sufficient explanation of the choice. It may be that Manning had private assurances of generous dealing from members of the Brown family, already prosperous and interested in education. It may be that the suspected heterodoxy of certain influential Newport Baptists led to the ignoring of what seemed to be the superior claims of that city. Possibly the prospect of being able to support himself in Providence by preaching may have led Manning to prefer the latter city.

In 1770 the college removed to Providence. Buildings were soon erected, the beginning of an endowment was created, additional instructors were secured, and the work of the institution began to compare favorably with that of the older colleges. During the war the buildings were used for barracks and other government purposes, and the work of instruction was sadly interrupted. After the war the prosperity of the college went hand in hand with the general prosperity of the denomination.

It is somewhat humiliating to find the college corporation voting (1793) to petition the General Assembly for "the grant of a lottery of four thousand dollars, for the

purpose of purchasing Dr. Forbes' Orrery and other articles of a Philosophical Apparatus; and for increasing the College library; and for other necessary and useful purposes." Such a procedure seems at that time to have been regarded as entirely legitimate and to have called forth no protests.

In 1804 Rhode Island College became Brown University, in honor of Nicholas Brown, whose liberality and that of members of the family to the present time have amply justified the change of name.

Manning served the college with noble self-sacrifice and the best kind of success till his death, in 1791. He was succeeded by Jonathan Maxcy, a graduate of the college, who served ably until 1802, when he accepted the presidency of Union College. He afterward became president of South Carolina College, where he taught and influenced for good some of the leaders of the Southern Baptists. The president during the closing years of this period was Dr. Asa Messer, also a graduate of the college. Since that time the university has been fortunate in having a succession of presidents of the highest rank, including Francis Wayland, Barnas Sears, Alexis Caswell, Ezekiel G. Robinson, and E. Benjamin Andrews; and its influence for good has been incalculable.

The Warren Association was organized at Warren, R. I., in 1767. The moving spirit was undoubtedly James Manning, but he had the hearty coöperation of Hezekiah Smith and others in New England, and the encouragement of the Philadelphia Association. Representatives of ten churches assembled to consider the proposal to organize; but those of four churches only saw their way clear to join in the enterprise. Even Isaac Backus, who was afterward to take so prominent a part in its proceedings, felt constrained to hold aloof until 1770. Backus's church, and many others, "waited until they could be satisfied that the Association

did not assume any jurisdiction over the churches, before joining, and they now joined upon the express condition that no complaint should ever be received by the Association against any particular church that was not of the Association, nor from any censured member of any of our churches." The four constituent churches were the Warren, R. I., and the Haverhill, Bellingham, and Second Middleborough, of Massachusetts. Scruples gradually gave place to confidence, and a large proportion of the churches of New England identified themselves with the Warren Association, until for convenience other associations were formed in various localities. The chief objects of Manning, Smith, and the other fathers of the Association were the securing of denominational coöperation in education, evangelization, and the struggle for religious liberty. How nobly it subserved the last end will appear in a subsequent chapter.

During this period the Baptist cause was extended into those New England colonies that had not been occupied up to 1740. There were a few Baptists in New Hampshire, but no church organization before the beginning of the present period. The first organization was effected at Newton in 1755. From 1767 onward Hezekiah Smith, pastor of the Haverhill, Mass., church, labored throughout the neighboring townships of New Hampshire with gratifying results. His own diary gives a picturesque account of the various meetings held. In May, 1767, he preached at Hampstead, Chester, Suncook, Dunbarton, and Deerfield; in June he assisted the Newton church in securing exemption from taxation to the standing order, and preached at Brentwood, New Market, Lee, Madbury, and Phillipstown, (Me.). At the last-mentioned place he "preached in a barn, because there was not room to hold the people in the meeting-house, and likewise because the barn was handiest to the

river, where I baptized that day Simon Coffin and Sarah Coffin." In August he baptized at Brentwood. "After the baptism at the water-side I spoke some time to the people, it being one of the most solemn times, and of the greatest emotion that I ever saw at the water-side." At Deerfield Smith baptized the Congregational minister, Eliphalet Smith, his wife, and twelve other members of his church, "who the same day were embodied into a Baptist church" (June 14, 1770). It may be remarked that Smith's visit on this occasion was in response to a special invitation from pastor and people. Two days later he baptized at Epping Dr. Samuel Shepard and six others. Shepard was ordained a year later and proved one of the most useful of the early New Hampshire ministers. Two days later (June 18th) Smith preached in the Congregational meeting-house at New Market and "had a conference with their church about some of their members who wanted to be baptized; but the church as a church would not give me leave to baptize any of their members." Two days later still he visited Stratham, where he examined a number for baptism, preached from John vii. 37, "and then baptized fourteen persons. . . . A glorious day has this been." The next day he "went home, after having baptized thirty-eight persons within seven days, and preached seven sermons." On July (or August) 18th he preached and baptized again at Stratham. "After baptism I entered into a public debate upon baptism with Rev. Joseph Adams and R. Marshall. . . . After debate I assisted in constituting a Baptist church there." Dr. Shepard became pastor of this along with other churches. On a subsequent visit to Stratham in September, "by reason of the number of the people," Smith was "obliged to preach out of doors, under an oak-tree." On October 9th he preached out of doors at Exeter, and "baptized

Joseph Sanborn, of Epping, a Congregational preacher," and five others. "It was judged that two thousand people were at the water-side to see the ordinance administered." The Brentwood church was organized in 1772 and enjoyed the ministry of Dr. Shepard along with Stratham, etc. The following year a church was constituted at Northwood, chiefly of members from Stratham and Epping, with Edmund Pillsbury, of Haverhill, as pastor. Baptist churches multiplied in New Hampshire from 1780 onward, partly through the zealous missionary activity of Caleb Blood, of Marlow, Job Seamans, of Massachusetts, and Biel Ledoyt, of Connecticut. Nine churches were organized during 1780. Thomas Baldwin, afterward to become famous as pastor of the Second Church, Boston, and as a leader in missionary enterprise, began preaching at Canaan in 1782, when eighteen years of age, and performed much fruitful service. The New Hampshire Association was formed in 1785 of five Maine and three New Hampshire churches. By 1795 there were in the State forty-one churches, with a membership of two thousand five hundred and sixty-two.

The people of Vermont were slow to accept Baptist teaching. In 1768 a party of Massachusetts Separates, who had moved to Vermont to enjoy greater freedom, adopted Baptist principles and were constituted a Baptist church at Shaftsbury. The second and third Vermont Baptist churches were organized in Guilford township (1770 and 1772). The Pownal church followed in 1773. Toward the close of the Revolutionary war there was a great influx of population into the colony, including many Baptists and a number of able ministers. The Shaftsbury Association was formed in 1781. By 1790 the number of churches had risen to thirty-four and the membership to sixteen hundred and ten. Four other associations were

formed in Vermont before the close of the century—the Woodstock (1783), the Vermont (1785), the Leyden (1793), and the Richmond (1795).

Nothing was attempted in the way of Baptist organization in Maine, after the removal of Screven and his brethren to South Carolina (1684), till 1767, when Hezekiah Smith made an evangelistic tour in the colony, baptizing a number of believers at Gorham, Block House, Sanford, etc. In 1768 Smith aided in constituting churches at Gorham and Berwick. The Sanford church was constituted in 1773.

In Maine also the closing years of the Revolution were a time of great denominational increase. The offer of free homesteads at the close of the war attracted large numbers of soldiers and others to the unsettled and sparsely settled regions, and the Baptist cause was thereby reinforced. Among the most successful Baptist workers were Nathaniel Lord, James Potter, Job Macomber, Isaac Case, and Elisha Snow. Among the earliest churches organized in Maine were the Berwick, Wells, Sanford, Coxhall, and Shapleigh. The Bowdoinham church was constituted in 1784 as a result of the labors of Potter and Macomber, with the latter as pastor. The Thomaston church was constituted a year later through the efforts of Case. From this time onward Baptist churches multiplied. The Bowdoinham Association was formed in 1787 and consisted of three churches. By the close of the century the number of churches was thirty-two and the membership fifteen hundred and sixty-eight.

Arminianism of the Wesleyan type appeared among the Baptists of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont about 1778. In September, 1770, Benjamin Randall, a godless young man of twenty-one, heard Whitefield at Portsmouth, N. H. Two days after leaving Portsmouth the great evan-

gelist died at Newburyport, Mass. Randall was more profoundly impressed by the news of his death than he had been by the preaching. He was converted and soon felt strongly impelled to evangelize. This prompting he long resisted. In 1775 he severed his connection with the Congregational church of which he was a member, on account of the laxity of its discipline. The birth of his third child led him to investigate the subject of infant baptism, and the result was his rejection of the rite. He was baptized into the fellowship of the Berwick, Me., Baptist church and soon afterward began his fruitful career as an evangelist. In 1778 he located at New Durham, N. H., but covered a wide territory with his evangelistic activity. It soon appeared to his Baptist brethren that he was not teaching the commonly accepted type of doctrine. Controversy arose and raged (1779), and he was convicted of Arminianism and disfellowshipped by a council of his brethren. Several other ministers in eastern New Hampshire and western Maine expressed sympathy with his views, notably Pelatiah Tingley, Samuel Weeks, Daniel Hibbard, Tosier Lord, and Edward Lock. In 1780 a Baptist church was organized at New Durham in sympathy with Randall's views. By 1790 there were eighteen churches in the connection, with about eight hundred members. Randall was abundant in labors, and his principles were soon firmly planted throughout Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. The doctrinal position of the party was that of evangelical Arminianism. Open communion was early adopted and has since characterized the denomination. For twenty years the churches refused any other designation than "Baptist." The persistence of the Regular Baptists in calling these brethren "Free-willers" led to their adoption of the name "Free-will Baptist." Randall died in 1808, and a period of denominational anarchy ensued. Quarterly meetings were held from 1783 onward,

but no general denominational organization occurred during this period. By 1810 the connection embraced about 130 churches, 110 ministers, and 6000 members.

A few statistics will show how largely the Baptist cause in New England profited by the Great Awakening. In 1740 there were in Massachusetts 6 Baptist churches, in Rhode Island 11, in Connecticut 4. Most of these were feeble and some of them were in a declining state. All but four or five seem to have been Arminian, and Arminianism had invaded some of the few Calvinistic churches. By 1768 the number of Baptist churches in Massachusetts had risen to 30, in Connecticut to 12, in Rhode Island to 36. The Baptist cause had taken root in New Hampshire and was represented by one congregation. But only a fair beginning had as yet been made. The Baptists by this time had attained to such a position in the New England colonies, and were so full of evangelistic zeal, that progress was henceforth easy. By 1790 Massachusetts had 92 Baptist churches and 6234 members; Rhode Island, 38 churches and 3502 members; New Hampshire, 32 churches and 1732 members; Maine, 15 churches and 882 members; Connecticut, 55 churches and 3214 members; Vermont, 34 churches and 1610 members. Twenty years later (1810-12) Maine's churches had increased to 103 and her membership to 5294; New Hampshire had 69 churches and 4940 members; Vermont had 76 churches and 5185 members; Massachusetts had a membership of 8104, but had suffered a loss of one in the number of churches; Connecticut had 65 churches and 5716 members; while Rhode Island had lost both in churches and members, the former numbering 26 and the latter 3033. Six Principle and Seventh-day Baptists are probably included in the statistics for 1790 and omitted in those for 1810. The Free-will Baptists seem to be omitted in the statistics of the States in which they flourished.

CHAPTER II.

THE PHILADELPHIA CENTER.¹

THE effects of the Great Awakening were less marked in the colonies included at the time in the Philadelphia Association than in New England. This was due to the fact that the Baptist work in these regions was already well organized and was relatively free from the hindering influences that in New England could be overcome only by a great religious upheaval. An evangelical Calvinism, substantially like that of Whitefield and the New Lights, had long prevailed among the Baptists of the Philadelphia Association. As Baptists had never been persecuted in these regions there was not that bitter sectarian feeling that led the Baptists of New England to look askance at a religious movement in which their former persecutors took part. The Baptists of Pennsylvania had by 1740 already reached a position of assured strength that enabled them to assert their principles with the utmost decision, while maintaining the most friendly relations with their brethren of other denominations. The growth of the churches in Pennsylvania and New Jersey during this period was only normal. During the war there was a marked decline of membership and interest. After the war there were years of large ingathering. A few statistics will illustrate the numerical condition of the denomi-

¹ Cf. Morgan Edwards; Spencer; Benedict; Catheart; "Min. Phil. Bapt. Assoc.," Cook; "Bapt. Mem.," vol. i., pp. 9 *seq.*, 74 *seq.*, vol. iii., pp. 197 *seq.*, vol. v., pp. 24 *seq.*, 36 *seq.*, 43 *seq.*, 69 *seq.*; and Read and Burkitt.

nation within the bounds of the Association. In 1762 the Association comprised churches in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New England, New York, Virginia, and Maryland, 29 in all, with a membership of 1318. The number of baptisms during the preceding year was 126. In 1762 the number of churches was 30, the number of baptisms 132, and the total membership 1585. In 1765, 33 churches are reported, 308 baptisms, and a membership of 2234. In 1776, 42 churches reported 188 baptisms and 3013 members. In 1807, although the constituency of the Association had been limited to Pennsylvania and New Jersey by the formation of other associations, 29 churches are reported, 251 baptisms, and 3632 members. In 1812 Pennsylvania had 63 Baptist churches and 4365 members; New Jersey, 35 churches and 2811 members; Delaware, 6 churches and 480 members; and Maryland, 14 churches and 697 members.

The territory of the Philadelphia Association was covered in general by the evangelistic efforts of the Tennents and their supporters. Though they had been cast out of the Synod at an early period of the revival movement, they had continued their work with unabated zeal. As the Presbyterians opposed to the revival had no such means of persecution as had the standing order in New England, the New Light Presbyterians were called upon to suffer nothing worse than ecclesiastical censure and damaging misrepresentation. Retaining the very effective Presbyterian discipline, and educating evangelists under strong Presbyterian influence, the Presbyterians of Tennent's school showed little susceptibility to the influence of Baptist principles. It is a historical fact, account for it as we may, that ground once preoccupied by Presbyterians is relatively irresponsive to Baptist effort. It is doubtful whether in a single case a Baptist church was

formed out of the membership of a New Light Presbyterian church in New Jersey or Pennsylvania, while scores of such cases occurred among the Separate churches of New England.

Yet the Baptists of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland enjoyed a gradual growth in membership, perfected their organization, gave much help and encouragement to those who were laboring in regions where circumstances were more favorable to extensive aggressive work, promoted the formation of associations as means of consolidating and conserving the results of the revival, and laid the foundation for the educational work of the denomination.

Doctrinal aberrations appeared from time to time in individuals and in churches, but the Association as a whole was so well established in sound doctrine that scarcely a ripple was caused thereby. In 1743 the attention of the Association was called to the fact that Joseph Eaton, pastor of the Montgomery church, had used expressions tending to cast doubt upon "the eternal generation and Sonship of Jesus Christ our Lord." "After some time spent in debate thereon," the accused brother "stood up, and freely, to our apprehension, recanted, renounced, and condemned all expressions, which he had heretofore used, whereby his brethren at Montgomery, or any persons elsewhere, were made to believe that he departed from the literal sense and meaning of that fundamental article in our confession of faith." The apology of the aged brother was accepted as satisfactory. The Association took occasion to exhort the people to content themselves and be satisfied "with the revealed will of God, concerning the unutterable, as well as inconceivable, mysteries of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three in one, and one in three, the co-essentiality, the co-eternity, and co-equality

of the three glorious Persons in one eternal God." "A number in one of our churches having suffered themselves to inquire therein, according to aforesaid rules of human reason and worldly wisdom, have become so entangled and confused, that they were carried so far as to question the Sonship of the second Person, as he is God, without having reference to his manhood and mediatory offices; which conception and supposition we not only disallow, but abhor and condemn, and are glad that God hath blessed means to convict the said parties of their sin and error; and herein we were, *nemine contradicente*, fully united to repel, and put a stop to, as far as we may, . . . the Arian, Socinian, and Antitrinitarian systems." Baptism by unbaptized or unauthorized persons was again and again repudiated.

In 1746 Benjamin Griffith was appointed to "collect and set in order the accounts of the several Baptist churches in these provinces, and keep a record of the proceedings of our denomination in these provinces." To his labors, under this commission, we are deeply indebted. In 1749 Griffith read before the Association an essay on "The Power and Duty of an Association of Churches." It would be difficult to find a juster presentation of the subject in Baptist literature. The views set forth are substantially those of the Baptists of to-day. It was determined in 1753 that no person should be ordained to the ministry on the judgment of a single church as to his fitness, but that a candidate for ordination should "visit other churches, and preach among them, and obtain from those churches concurring evidence of their approbation."

In 1755 a day of fasting and prayer was appointed, and for the following year it was decided that these exercises be "continued quarterly throughout the year, unless we shall have cause to turn our fasting into thanks and praise

to God for deliverance granted." These fast-days were kept up for many years.

Several brethren were appointed in 1755 and often afterward to visit struggling Baptist communities near and far in correspondence with the Association. This year brethren were appointed to visit Virginia and North Carolina, and Cape May.

It was agreed in 1756 to "raise a sum of money towards the encouragement of a Latin Grammar School for the promotion of learning amongst us, under the care of Brother Isaac Eaton." This school was conducted at Hopewell, N. J., and proved highly serviceable to the denomination. Six years later the Association wrote the London ministers, informing them of the state of the churches and suggesting that they do something for the academy. "A few books proper for such a school, or a small apparatus, or some pieces of apparatus, are more immediately wanted, and not to be had easily in these parts. We have also, of late, endeavored to form a library at Philadelphia, for the use of our brethren in the ministry who are not able to purchase books." From an earlier minute it appears that the nucleus of this library consisted of books sent out by Thomas Hollis, of London. Morgan Edwards, who was to be the chief historian of the churches of the Association, was the moving spirit in these literary and educational endeavors.

It is somewhat startling to find the Association, in 1762, granting a certificate to a minister stating that he has "been admitted into holy orders, according to the known and approved rites of the Baptist Church."

In 1762, or earlier, members of the Association, under the inspiration of Morgan Edwards, began to plan for the establishment of a Baptist college. It was felt that more than anything else such an institution would contribute to

the dignity and strength of the denomination. A number of Baptist young men had been educated and were being educated at Princeton, at the University of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere; but it was felt that an adequate number of educated ministers would never be secured until the denomination should have an institution of its own in which Baptist principles should predominate and in which denominational life should be fostered. It was the opinion of Morgan Edwards and the brethren with whom he took counsel that, all things considered, Rhode Island was the most advantageous location for a Baptist college. It would have been impossible to secure a charter in Massachusetts or Connecticut, and these State colonies were already supplied with university facilities. The advantages of Rhode Island from the point of view of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey brethren were probably the following: 1. It was highly probable that a charter could be readily secured in that land of civil and religious liberty; 2. The Baptists of Rhode Island had grown up with the country and many of them had attained to wealth and high political and social position, whereas the Baptists of Pennsylvania and New Jersey were poor and could not have contributed very largely toward the establishment of a university; 3. The geographical position of Rhode Island was central as regards the Baptist population of the northern and middle colonies. James Manning, who had just been graduated with high honors at Princeton, was selected by these brethren of the Philadelphia Association to proceed to Rhode Island, to confer with leading Baptists there, and to take necessary steps for securing a charter. The churches of the Association contributed liberally, according to their means, for the equipment and support of the college; but the noblest contributions they made were the idea and the man.

At about the same time the Association contributed another Princeton graduate, Hezekiah Smith, to New England. The Warren Association, formed on the model of the Philadelphia, was due to this noble contribution of men and to the friendly intercourse that was thus established. The welding of the new Baptists of New England with the old was due to the same influence.

Earlier still (1749) the Association had contributed to the Baptist cause in South Carolina a minister who was to prove a source of strength and unity to the cause. Oliver Hart was thoroughly imbued with the principles of the Baptists of the Association, and two years after his settlement secured the organization of the Charleston Association, which was in its purposes and its work almost an exact copy of the Philadelphia.

The Association had a large share in the Baptist work of Virginia. Men and money were always available whenever there was an opportunity to advance the Baptist cause. The Ketokton Association, Virginia, was likewise modeled on that of which the churches composing it had been members. In 1774 it was agreed that the churches be recommended to contribute to a fund for "brethren suffering under ecclesiastical oppression in New England."

After the formation of other associations it was the custom of the Philadelphia Association to appoint and receive fraternal delegates. Thus the bonds of brotherhood were maintained and the unity of the denomination greatly promoted.

Among the ministers of the Philadelphia Association during this period Morgan Edwards held high rank. He was born in Wales (1722) and educated at Bristol Baptist College. After nine years of ministerial service in Ireland and one year in England, he became pastor of the Philadelphia church, on the recommendation of Dr. Gill, in

1761. He is said to have been the only Baptist minister in America who opposed the Revolution. This singularity no doubt interfered seriously with his popularity as a minister. He gave up regular preaching in 1771, and his name does not occur in the minutes of the Association from 1776 to 1791, although in 1785 the churches were recommended "to make enquiry among themselves . . . what number they will respectively take, of an intended publication of materials towards the history of the Baptists in New Jersey." The leisure secured by the intermission of ministerial labor he employed to good account in making a most painstaking collection and digest of the materials of the Baptist history of America. He visited Baptist communities from New Hampshire to Georgia in the interest of his history. He died in 1795, having retained to the end the fullest confidence of his brethren.

The ablest and most trusted leader among the ministers of the Association during this period was undoubtedly Dr. Samuel Jones. His parents had removed to Pennsylvania in 1737, when he was two years of age. He was graduated from the College of Philadelphia in 1762, the same year in which Manning and Smith were graduated from Princeton. He possessed ample learning, a strong personality, a magnificent physique, and practical wisdom of the highest order. Eloquent and amiable, he won the hearts of all, and to the close of his long life in 1812 he was a Nestor among his brethren. He had only one pastorate, that of the Lower Dublin (Pennepek) church, which he served from 1762 till his death. He preached the centennial associational sermon, to be hereafter referred to.

Less equable and amiable than Dr. Jones, but more vigorous and energetic, and perhaps equally effective during his time, was Abel Morgan. Born at Welsh Tract, Del., in 1713, he became pastor of the Middletown, N. J.,

church in 1739 and served the church till his death, in 1785. Dr. Jones spoke of him as "the incomparable Morgan," and Morgan Edwards characterized him as "not a custom divine, nor a leading-string divine, but a Bible divine." Much of his time and strength he devoted to evangelistic work outside his own community. He endured hardness as a good soldier of Christ. When his principles were assailed he was not slow to defend them. His debate in 1742 with Samuel Findley, afterward president of Princeton College, did much for the advancement of the Baptist cause and was long remembered throughout the region in which it occurred. His argument was afterward printed and was considered by his brethren able and effective.

In his centennial sermon (1807) Dr. Jones mentions among the leading ministers of this period Benjamin Griffith, already referred to as the compiler of the early history of the churches and as the careful secretary of the Association, whom he characterizes as "eminent in council, and perhaps more so for the use of his pen." Among those who labored during the latter part of this period, he esteems worthy of special mention John Davis, of Harford, Md.; Robert Kelsay, of Cohansey; P. P. Vanhorn, of Lower Dublin; Isaac Eaton, of Hopewell; Mr. Walton, of Morristown; Isaac Stelle, of Piscataqua; Benjamin Miller, of Scotch Plains; and John Gano, of New York. "These were burning and shining lights, especially the three last."

Just before the close of this period there comes upon the stage of action a preacher more highly gifted than any of those mentioned, who was to become one of the leading educators in the early part of the next period. This was William Staughton. Born in England, 1770, and educated at Bristol College, he came to America in 1793. After laboring in South Carolina and New Jersey, he became

pastor (in 1805) of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia. In 1811 he became pastor of the Sansom Street Church, a colony of the First, where he remained till 1821, when he accepted the presidency of Columbian College. While in Philadelphia he devoted much of his time to training students for the ministry, and his eloquence and learning gave him a foremost position among the ministers of the city. He was to be the first corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Board of Foreign Missions.

The original First Baptist Church of New York had become virtually extinct with the removal of Nicholas Eyres to Newport in 1732. It was always feeble and had become involved in debt. Baptist services were resumed about 1745 in the house of Jeremiah Dodge, who had removed to the city from Fishkill, where a church had been constituted. Benjamin Miller, of New Jersey, visited New York and baptized Joseph Meeks soon afterward; and these, with the coöperation of Robert North, of the original church, secured the services of John Pine, of Fishkill. A number of the members of the older church were led to abandon their Arminian views and to join in the services. Benjamin Miller having become pastor of the Scotch Plains church (N. J.), the Baptists of New York, about thirteen in number, united with that church in 1753, having arranged that the pastor should preach in the city occasionally and administer the Supper quarterly. Their numbers having increased, they were constituted a church in 1762, with the good-will of the church to which they had belonged. John Gano, of New Jersey, had been secured as pastor. Under his wise and vigorous leadership the church was greatly prospered, and before the close of this period had taken its place among the foremost churches in the land. Gano served the church for twenty-six years, when failing health compelled him to seek a

milder climate. Before he entered upon his New York pastorate he had become widely known as an evangelist under the Philadelphia Association. Like Hezekiah Smith, he was a staunch supporter of the colonial cause and served throughout the war as chaplain. He was succeeded by Benjamin Foster, whose conversion to Baptist views and whose pastorate in Newport have already been narrated.

A strong Baptist interest was developed in Dutchess County, N. Y., from 1745 onward. The first organization was that at Fishkill. The North-east church was constituted in 1751; the Dover in 1757; the Stanford in 1759; and the Warwick in 1766. Little is known about the earliest history of the Fishkill church. It was probably made up of Baptists from New England. Elder Halstead was the first pastor. This church seems to have become extinct after a few years. The North-east church was a result of the Great Awakening. A Separate church was formed of members who seceded from a Presbyterian church, and of these Separates many became Baptists, including Simon Dakin, the first pastor of this Baptist church. The Dover church was formed under like influences. Samuel Waldo was its first pastor, and through his energetic efforts the Baptist cause was greatly promoted throughout this part of the colony. The Stanford church was organized with the assistance and under the influence of the old Swansea church, to which most of its constituent members may have previously belonged. Ephraim and Comer Bullock were early appointed to administer the ordinances, and the latter long served in the ministry.

From 1763 onward the settlement of the vast and fertile regions of northern and western New York was exceedingly rapid, a considerable degree of safety from French and Indian attacks having been secured by the Treaty of Paris. Large numbers of New England Separates removed to

these newly opened regions to escape persecution and to better their worldly position. Some came as Baptists and many more were led by the logic of their position into the Baptist ranks. In 1773 two Baptist families from Warwick, N. Y., removed far into the wilderness, and settled on Butternut Creek in Otsego County. Other families followed them and a church was soon organized. From this center Baptist teaching radiated throughout a large part of western New York. It is impracticable to follow the work in its details.

A few statistics will show that New York proved one of the most fertile fields in which Baptist principles were ever planted. In 1750 there were at most three or four Baptist organizations in the colony, some of the older churches having become extinct. In 1770 there were 7 small churches. By 1784, 4 churches had been added and the membership exceeded 700. In 1792 there were 62 churches, with a membership of about 4000. By 1812 the astonishing figures of 239 churches and 18,499 members had been reached.

During the early part of this period several of these scattered churches connected themselves with the Philadelphia Association. In 1791 the New York and Warwick Associations were formed; in 1795, the Otsego; in 1796, the Rensselaerville; in 1801, the Cayuga; in 1802, the Essex and Champlain; in 1806, the Saratoga; in 1808, the Madison and the Black River; in 1810, the Union; in 1811, the Franklin; in 1812, the St. Lawrence; and in 1813, the Ontario. In 1807 the Lake Missionary Society, known from 1808 as the Hamilton Missionary Society, was formed at Pompey. A full documentary history of the New York Baptists is a desideratum.

CHAPTER III.

VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA.¹

IT will be remembered that near the close of the preceding period feeble churches of the General Baptist persuasion were organized at Burleigh and Surrey. In 1743 a small party of Maryland General Baptists, of whom Edward Hays and Thomas Yates were the leaders, settled on the Opekon, in Frederick County. Henry Loveall, who had been their pastor in Maryland, soon followed them. The church may have retained its original organization, or may have been organized anew. It had come into a disordered state by 1752, when it was visited, probably at the request of some of its members, by Benjamin Miller, John Thomas, and John Gano, ministers of the Philadelphia Association, who, according to a MS. account used by Semple, "new modeled the church, forming it upon the Calvinistic plan, sifting out the chaff, and retaining the supposed good grain." According to Gano's account, "out of the whole who offered themselves, there were only three received." These three "were constituted, and six more were baptized and joined with them." "Some openly declared they knew they could not give an account of experiencing a work of grace, and therefore need not offer themselves." Some sought to be further instructed

¹ Cf. Semple; Howell; Curry; Henning, "Statutes at Large"; Hawks, "Contr. to Ecc. Hist."; Taylor; Foote, "Sketches of Virg."; Asplund; Read and Burkitt; and Rippon.

and "afterwards professed and became zealous members." The new-modeled church had for its pastor in 1754 Samuel Heaton, who, "driven from his possessions by the Indians," returned to Pennsylvania by 1656 and was for many years (1761 onward) pastor of the Dividing Creek church, New Jersey. His place was taken by John Garrard, probably the same as John Jaret, whom brethren appointed by the Association in 1755 to visit Virginia and North Carolina had been authorized to ordain. The name of John Garret appears in the minutes of the Association in 1755 and 1758, and from 1761 onward as pastor of the Opekon, Va., church.

The Ketokton church, in Loudon County, was the next to be constituted. The date of the organization, which Semple is inclined to put in 1756, was, according to the minutes of the Philadelphia Association, October 8, 1751. According to the latter authority the first pastor of this church was John Thomas, probably a missionary of the Association, who shortly afterward returned to Pennsylvania, where he died in 1791, aged seventy-nine. Semple seems to be in error in making Garrard the first pastor of this church. The Opekon and the Ketokton churches were received into the Philadelphia Association in 1754. A third church was formed at Smith's Creek, Frederick County, in August, 1756, under the ministry of John Alderson, a missionary of the Philadelphia Association. A number of Baptists from the North had settled there about eleven years before, and these had been visited in the mean time by Samuel Eaton (Heaton), Benjamin Griffith, and John Gano, of the Philadelphia Association. This church united with the Association in 1762. These three churches began holding yearly meetings in 1757, it being impossible for any considerable number to participate in the meetings of the Philadelphia Association.

The visit of Shubael Stearns and Daniel Marshall, Separate Baptists from New England, in 1754, produced a strong impression on many of the Baptists of the old order. Those who disapproved of the enthusiasm introduced into the meetings through this influence asked the Association to investigate the matter. Benjamin Miller was sent, and was so pleased with the zeal complained of as to say, that if he had such warm-hearted Christians in his church he would not take gold for them. A revival followed, resulting in many conversions. The pastor of the Ketokton church for a number of years, beginning some time before 1761, was John Marks, of whom little further is known. Garrard and Alderson labored in this region for many years with great fidelity and success as pastors and evangelists; and to them a number of churches owe their origin.

About 1762 a church was organized at Broad Run in Fauquier County under the ministry of David Thomas, who had been "admitted into holy orders" in the Philadelphia Association, as attested in the certificate of the Association, dated October 13, 1762, and signed by Morgan Edwards. While visiting the older Baptist communities he met two men who had, without special human agency, come to feel their need of gospel privileges, and who had made a journey of sixty miles to secure the help of the Baptists. Thomas was prevailed upon to visit their community. The result of his visit was a religious awakening and the organization of a church. Thomas was a man of rare evangelistic gifts. He labored over an extensive territory and was instrumental in the conversion of multitudes who had never before heard evangelical preaching. Through the labors of Thomas and Garrard, who often traveled together, Baptist principles were planted throughout all the upper counties of the Northern Neck.

These Regular Baptists were opposed with less violence than might have been expected. The Episcopal ministers, as historians of their own persuasion freely admit, were for the most part irreligious and immoral, and lived in idleness and pleasure at the public expense. The people were almost entirely neglected and had in turn lost confidence in those who were theoretically their spiritual guides. There was among the people a hungering and thirsting for the living word. Many traveled great distances to hear evangelical preaching and importuned the preachers to visit their destitute communities. Thus evangelical teaching extended from one community to another. Among the most noted ministers raised up under the preaching of Thomas and Garrard were Daniel and William Fristoe and James Ireland. Daniel Fristoe, though unlearned, was one of the most powerful preachers of the time. The influence of a sermon of his on President Manning has been referred to in an earlier chapter.

The Ketokton Association was formed in 1766, with the hearty approval and coöperation of the Philadelphia, of the four churches already mentioned. By the close of this period it embraced thirty-six churches, with a membership of more than two thousand.

The Baptist work in the territory covered by the Ketokton Association was accomplished, as has been seen, under the directing and fostering care of the Philadelphia Association and partook of the character of that body. Both had felt the influence of the great revival and of the Separate Baptist movement without fully identifying themselves therewith. The Ketokton Association adopted the Philadelphia recension of the London Confession of Faith of 1689, with the articles on communion and the imposition of hands. The latter was rigorously practiced and insisted on for more than twenty years. After the great

revival of 1785-87 and the union of Regulars and Separates in 1787, "first the necessity, and then the propriety of it, began to be questioned, until it was finally disused; and in the revisal of the Confession of Faith that article was expunged" (Semple).

The practical wisdom of the Association was distinctly inferior to that of the Philadelphia. There was lacking that patient and persistent effort to allay strife and prevent schism that constituted the strength of the mother Association. The question was raised at one of the sessions whether one's refusal to bear his proportion of the expenses of the church, according to his property, should be a matter of discipline. It was determined that a church might properly tax each member according to his ability and exclude him in case he refused to submit. Some of the churches, to their sorrow, attempted to act on this advice. In 1787 the question of slavery was introduced. It was determined that hereditary slavery is a breach of the divine law. A committee was appointed to bring in a plan for gradual emancipation. This excited such a tumult in the churches that the Association felt constrained to resolve to take no further steps in this business. The repudiation of what has been called "alien immersion" was more pronounced here than in the Philadelphia Association. Much commotion was raised in 1791 by the dealing of the Association with James Hutchinson and a church he had gathered and baptized. Hutchinson had been converted among the Methodists and immersed by a Methodist preacher. He began his ministry in Georgia, and after carefully considering his case the Georgia Baptists had accepted his baptism and recognized him as a minister. While visiting relatives in Virginia a large number were converted through his preaching and were by him baptized and organized into a church. The attention of

the Association having been called to the fact that Hutchinson had been baptized by a Methodist, it was determined that neither pastor nor church could be received into the Association unless they would submit to be rebaptized. Fortunately for the peace of the Association, they accepted these terms.

At the close of the last period, it will be recalled, two small General Baptist churches had been organized in Virginia, the one in Isle of Wight County, the other in Surrey, and were under the pastoral care of Richard Jones and Caspar Mintz. A number of General Baptists had removed from Virginia to North Carolina, where, under the leadership of Paul Palmer, a church was constituted. About 1740 William Sojourner, a member of the Burleigh church, removed to North Carolina and gathered another General Baptist church. Through the labors of Palmer, Sojourner, and Joseph Parker, a number of churches were constituted during the early years of the present period. In December, 1756, the church at Burleigh sent the following letter to the Philadelphia Association: "The church of Jesus Christ, in Isle of Wight County, holding adult baptism, etc., to the Reverend and General Assembly or Association at Philadelphia, send greeting: We, the above-mentioned church, confess ourselves to be under clouds of darkness concerning the faith of Jesus Christ, not knowing whether we are on the right foundation, and the church much unsettled: wherefore we desire alliance with you, and that you will be pleased to send us helps to settle the church, and rectify what may be wrong." The letter is subscribed by Caspar Mintz, Richard Jones, and eleven others. It is probable that the church was visited by Gano, Vanhorn, and Miller, who about this time were frequently in Virginia and North Carolina. These ministers of the Philadelphia Association were for the most part

cordially received, and they presented the truth with such fervor and power that large numbers abandoned their Arminianism. Where such were sufficiently numerous they were organized into churches. The work was continued after the departure of these brethren. A few persisted in Arminianism.

In 1765 these churches formed the Kehukee Association. Several of the North Carolina churches composing this Association had in 1758 and 1760 united with the Charleston Association.¹ The Charleston Association arranged for an annual meeting of ministers for the churches of North Carolina and the northern part of South Carolina about 1758. The Baptist cause greatly prospered in the regions covered by this Association. By 1790 it embraced sixty-one churches, with more than five thousand members. In that year it was divided, the Virginia churches forming the Portsmouth Association.

The peculiarities of the General Baptist churches out of which this great Baptist community grew were Arminian doctrine and culpable laxity in receiving members and in exercising discipline. It was said that Palmer and his associates required no profession of a change of heart on the part of candidates for baptism. When awakened by the searching preaching of men like Gano, Vanhorn, and Miller, a large proportion of the members felt that now for the first time they understood what conversion meant. In passing over from the General to the Regular Baptist position some of the churches had failed to eliminate those who were unable to make a profession of conversion. It was thought that, due care being exercised in the future reception of members, the unconverted element would

¹ Woolf Furman, "History of the Charleston Association," gives these dates in his narrative (p. 13), but in his statistical table (p. 55) he gives 1755 to 1759 as the dates of admission.

soon disappear through conversion or death. The Separate Baptists having become numerous and noted for their piety and zeal in this part of Virginia, advances were made by the Kehukee Association in 1772 pointing to the establishment of communion between the two bodies. The Separates objected on the ground that the churches of the Association were not sufficiently strict in receiving members, were "too superfluous" in their dress, and retained many members who acknowledged themselves to have been baptized in a state of unbelief. This rebuff led the more zealous members of the Association to attempt a reformation. A meeting was held in Elder Burkitt's church (1774), in which it was resolved not to hold communion with any who confessed that they were baptized before their conversion. The meeting of the Association the next year was a stormy one. Each party claimed to be the Association. The reformers were finally victorious and gained as much by accessions of Separate churches as they lost by the defection of the lax party.

In 1789 those churches that had withdrawn in 1775 on account of the determination of the majority to insist on converted membership were received back into fellowship, the difficulties that formerly existed having been removed. The chief mover in the reformation of 1774 onward was Lemuel Burkitt.

This Association was greatly concerned, as has been seen, for the union of the Regulars and Separates, and was largely instrumental in bringing about this happy event. The decisions of questions of doctrine and polity are in accord with the strictest Baptist principles, but for the most part display a spirit of moderation. The brief confession of faith adopted by the Association in 1777 was designed to meet the objections of the Separates, who would have refused the Philadelphia Confession, and yet

to exclude churches that were lax in receiving members and every form of Arminianism. The Association was alive to the importance of church extension and sustained itinerant preaching. Baptism by unauthorized persons was declared to be irregular and undesirable, but not invalid. Freemasonry was regarded as inconsistent with church-membership. The support of pastors and itinerant preachers was again and again insisted on as a requirement of the gospel.

The third great Baptist movement in Virginia and North Carolina, and in some respects the most important, is that introduced from New England through the Separate Baptist evangelists, Shubael Stearns and Daniel Marshall. Stearns was a native of Boston (born 1706). He was converted in connection with the great revival, and, like many other Separates, adopted antipedobaptist views. He was baptized by Wait Palmer at Toland, Conn., in 1751, and was soon afterward ordained. Filled with zeal for the spread of the gospel, he made his way southward in 1754. He stopped for a while in Virginia and had some conference with the Baptists of Opekon. Here he met Daniel Marshall, his brother-in-law, who had just been engaged in a mission to the Mohawk Indians at the head of the Susquehanna. Marshall was born in Connecticut in 1706 and had likewise been converted in the great revival. He had heard Whitefield preach and had caught his enthusiasm. Indeed, it would seem that he had been well-nigh carried off his balance by his expectation of the near approach of the latter-day glory, and was of those who with almost fanatical zeal sold, gave away, or abandoned their possessions and without scrip or purse rushed away to convert the heathen and thus hasten the glorious appearing of Christ. In the words of his son, "he exchanged his commodious buildings for a miserable hut;

his fruitful fields and loaded orchards for barren deserts; the luxuries of a well-furnished table for coarse and scanty fare; and numerous civil friends for rude savages." Driven away by Indian wars after a year and a half of earnest effort, he made his way to Virginia. Here he came in contact with the Baptist work that was being carried on under the auspices of the Philadelphia Association. He and his wife were led to examine the Baptist faith and were soon convinced that believers' baptism alone had Scriptural warrant. They were baptized and he was licensed to preach. His later career was truly apostolic in its spirit and results. Though ill educated, by no means brilliantly endowed, and already forty-eight years of age, he was to be instrumental, during the thirty years of life that remained to him, in the conversion of multitudes and in planting Baptist churches in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

Stearns was more highly gifted and equally zealous. After laboring for some months in Virginia without such success as he craved, he removed to Guilford County, N. C., where he found a people almost destitute of religious privileges, but ready to listen to the earnest proclamation of the truth. The Separate Baptists from New England brought with them the eccentricities of manner that characterized the New Light movement. It is doubtful whether any evangelist but Whitefield surpassed Stearns in magnetic power over audiences. His tones were peculiarly impressive and captivating, and his eyes seem to have had almost magical power over those upon whom they were fixed. Trembling, weeping, screaming, and catalepsy were common effects of his highly impassioned exhortations.

The number of Baptists in Stearns's company, including Daniel Marshall and his wife, was sixteen. They at once organized themselves as a church and began aggressive

work in the community. In a few years the Sandy Creek church had increased to 606. Marshall soon gathered a church at Abbott's Creek, about thirty miles distant. Difficulty was experienced in finding a minister willing to co-operate with Stearns in ordaining him. The pastor of a church on the Peedee River, S. C., was requested to serve, but refused on the ground that the Separates allowed women to pray in public and illiterate men to preach, and encouraged noise and confusion in their meetings. It may be here remarked that Mrs. Marshall was noted for her zeal and eloquence, and that she added greatly to the interest of meetings conducted by her husband. The services of Elder Ledbetter, another brother-in-law of Marshall, laboring at that time in South Carolina, were finally secured and the ordination was accomplished. A church organized at Little River, N. C., in 1760, with a membership of five, increased in three years to five hundred. A number of zealous preachers were soon raised up, and the work spread with such rapidity that by 1775 the Sandy Creek church, to use the language of Morgan Edwards, who at that time traversed the field for the collection of historical materials, "had spread her branches southward as far as Georgia; eastward, to the sea and Chesapeake Bay; and northward, to the waters of the Potomac. It, in seventeen years, became mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother, to 42 churches, from which sprung 125 ministers, many of whom are ordained, and support the sacred character as well as any set of clergy in America."

Marshall early extended his labors into the adjacent parts of Virginia. Among his converts was Dutton Lane (1758), who became at once a most effective preacher. Forty-two persons converted through his efforts were baptized by Marshall, and in 1760 a church was consti-

tuted with Lane as pastor. This was the first Separate Baptist church in Virginia. Shortly after Lane's conversion the ministry of "the Murphy boys" was blessed to the conversion of a man who was to be the apostle of the Virginia Baptists. This was Colonel Samuel Harris, one of the most popular public men of his county. In the performance of his military duties he chanced to see a number of people gathering. Having been informed of the nature of the meeting he was led by curiosity to dismount and enter. He was profoundly impressed, and at the close of the service his military accouterments were found scattered around. He soon afterward found peace in believing, and casting aside his worldly honors he began preaching with wonderful power. Marshall soon afterward directed his way southward and left the Virginia work largely in Harris's hands. A number of churches having been gathered in North Carolina and Virginia by 1759, Stearns visited them all and induced them to send delegates to his meeting-house for the purpose of organizing an Association. Delegates met in January, 1760, and adjourned to July. "We continued together three or four days," wrote one of the participants. "Great crowds of people attended, mostly through curiosity. The great power of God was among us. The preaching every day seemed to be attended with God's blessing. We carried on our association with sweet decorum and fellowship to the end. Then we took leave of one another, with many solemn charges from our reverend old father, Shubael Stearns, to stand fast unto the end."

The next meeting of the Association was largely attended. John Gano, of the Philadelphia Association, was present to inquire into the great work that was going on and to assist with counsel. Stearns received him cordially, but most of the ministers viewed him with suspicion and

refused to invite him to participate in the meeting. Yet he was invited to preach, which he did to the delight and astonishment of the ministers, some of whom felt as if they could never preach again after hearing such eloquence. Gano was able to report that "doubtless the power of God was among them. That although they were rather immethodical, they certainly had the root of the matter at heart."

In 1767 a collision occurred in evangelistic work between the Separate Baptists and those of the Ketokton Association. The Regulars were first on the field with their zealous preachers, Garrard and Thomas. Harris and Read were led by divine guidance, as they supposed, into this region, and were preaching with wonderful results. The Regulars were anxious to allay any ill feeling that might have arisen and to secure such a union with the Separates as would insure harmony of action. In 1769 the Ketokton Association sent three messengers to the Association of the Separates with an earnest plea for peace. "If we are all Christians, all Baptists, all New Lights, why are we divided?" they asked. "Must the little appellative names, Regular and Separate, break the golden band of charity, and set the sons and daughters of Zion at variance? . . . To indulge ourselves in prejudice, is surely a disorder; and to quarrel about nothing, is irregularity with a witness. Our dear brethren, endeavor to prevent this calamity for the future." The matter was much discussed, but the Association rejected the overtures by a small majority.

The progress of the Separate Baptist movement from 1760 to 1770 was almost unexampled in Baptist history. Under such evangelists as Samuel Harris and John Waller whole communities were stirred to their depths and strong Baptist churches were established where the Baptist name

had scarcely been heard of a short time before. In South Carolina as well as in North Carolina and Virginia the evangelists had found fruitful soil. The Association had come to be inconveniently large as regards territory and the number of churches embraced. Stearns, who had been the chief organizer of the work of the Association, laid more stress upon a vigorous connectional life than upon the independence of the churches. As his methods of work had much in common with those of the early Methodists, so his idea of the interdependence of the churches was Methodist rather than Baptist. According to Morgan Edwards, whose information was direct, the Association "carried matters so high as to unfellowship ordinations, ministers, and churches that acted independent of them." The theory was that "though complete power be in every church, yet every church can transfer it to an Association." The spirit of independence had become so much a part and parcel of the Baptist system that such interference with the autonomy of the churches was sure to be resented. The Association, under the inspiration of Shubael Stearns, had made unanimity essential to any Associational action. At the Associational meeting of 1770 proceedings were blocked from the very beginning. A unanimous vote for moderator could not be secured. The next day was devoted to fasting and prayer, but at the close of the day unanimity had been reached in nothing. The following day was spent in the same way until three o'clock, when a proposal to divide the Association into three parts, one for each State represented, was unanimously adopted. The North Carolina division retained the name Sandy Creek, the South Carolina division adopted the name Congaree, and the Virginia division the name Rapid-ann. The last soon came to be known as the General Association of Separate Baptists.

The difficulties that had brought about the dissolution of the old Association seem to have been completely removed by the division. The churches continued to multiply and the membership to increase. The number of members reported in the Virginia division at the first meeting in 1771 was 1335, with two churches not heard from. In May, 1773, 3195 members were reported, of whom 526 had been baptized since September, 1772. Associational meetings were held twice each year and were largely attended. In September, 1773, the Association was again divided; but the necessity of coöperation in striving against ecclesiastical oppression, and the diminished interest taken in the smaller gatherings, caused a reunion a few years later.

Difficulties in relation to doctrine and polity early arose in the Virginia Separate body. In 1774 a query was raised: "Ought all the ministerial gifts recorded in the 4th of Ephesians, 11th, 12th, and 13th verses, to be in use at the present time?" A majority favored the affirmative, while paying a due regard to the distinction between ordinary and extraordinary gifts. The question was brought up again at a subsequent meeting, when it was decided almost unanimously (the three opponents finally concurring) "that the said offices are now in use in Christ's church." It was further resolved "that the said offices be immediately established, by the appointment of certain persons to fill them." Samuel Harris was chosen apostle by unanimous consent. Provision was made for the disciplining of the apostle in case he should transgress, by the church offended, with the help of two or three neighboring churches, final action to be left to a general conference of the churches. Harris was solemnly ordained to the apostolate, John Waller, E. Craig, and John Williams taking the leading part, and the whole Association giving

the right hand of fellowship. The ordination of Harris was for the southern district of the Association. At the meeting of the Association for the northern district in the following autumn, John Waller and Elijah Craig were likewise constituted apostles. In this effort to restore the apostolate we see another evidence of the close relationship of the Separate Baptist movement to the Methodist. The apostolate was simply episcopacy or general superintendency under another name.

Still another indication of the influence of Methodism, now a well-organized and aggressive movement in these parts, was the adoption of Arminian views by some of the most trusted leaders of the connection. In 1775 it was queried: "Is salvation by Christ made possible for every individual of the human race?" Two of the apostles and Jeremiah Walker, one of the most learned and eloquent of the ministers, took the affirmative side, while the other apostle, William Murphy, and John Williams earnestly argued for particular redemption. A small majority decided in favor of the Calvinistic position, although the Arminian side had the abler supporters. The result was that Harris, Waller, and Walker withdrew. Williams was chosen moderator in place of Harris, who had vacated the chair. It looked as if the connection was to be hopelessly shattered. Fortunately the spirit of brotherly love was stronger than the spirit of partisanship. The Arminian party, after taking counsel together, addressed the following conciliatory letter to the party in the majority, signed by Samuel Harris as moderator: "Dear Brethren: A steady union with you makes us willing to be more explicit, in our answer to your terms of reconciliation proposed. We do not deny the former part of your proposal, respecting particular election of grace, still retaining our liberty, with regard to construction. And as to the latter

part, respecting merit in the creature, we are free to profess there is none." The Calvinistic party, who had made overtures to the Arminians that called forth the above letter, received it in the same conciliatory spirit. Their reply, signed by John Williams, moderator, was as follows: "Dear Brethren: Inasmuch as a continuation of your Christian fellowship seems nearly as dear to us as our lives, and seeing our difficulties concerning your principles, with respect to merit in the creature, particular election, and final perseverance of the saints, are in a hopeful measure removing, we do willingly retain you in fellowship, not raising the least bar. But do heartily wish and pray, that God in his kind providence, in his own time, will bring it about, when Israel shall be of one mind, speaking the same things." The reconciliation was a most happy one, and discord which might have proved disastrous was averted.

A period of marked spiritual depression began at about this time. The political troubles that were to result in the war of independence absorbed a large share of attention. The Baptists of Virginia and the entire South entered into the struggle for civil liberty with the utmost decision and zeal, believing that civil liberty was a condition of religious liberty. They availed themselves of the popular enthusiasm for civil liberty to secure for themselves and for all that liberty of conscience for which Baptists have so persistently contended. The history of the struggle of the Virginia Baptists for civil and religious liberty, in which the Separate Baptists took the leading part, must be reserved for another chapter.

Up to 1783 the General Association of the Separate Baptists had been kept up and two meetings held each year for the better accommodation of the large constituency. It was now dissolved, and in its place was created

a General Committee, to be "composed of not more than four delegates from each district association, to meet annually, to consider matters that may be for the good of the whole society." It was further resolved "that the present association be divided into four districts: Upper and Lower District, on each side of the James River."

Happily for the peace of the connection, the Arminian tendencies that had manifested themselves in 1775 speedily disappeared. A number of leaders continued to lean toward Arminianism, but the sentiment of the denomination as a whole was so decidedly Calvinistic that they felt it necessary in the interest of peace to keep their Arminian views somewhat in the background. When the General Association was dividing itself into sections, it was moved by John Williams that a confession of faith be adopted which should afford a standard of principles for subsequent times. The Philadelphia Confession was agreed upon, with the following explanations: "To prevent its usurping a tyrannical power over the consciences of any: We do not mean that every person is bound to the strict observance of everything therein contained, nor do we mean to make it, in any respect, superior or equal to the Scriptures, in matters of faith and practice; although we think it the best human composition of the kind now extant; yet it shall be liable to alterations, whenever the General Committee, in behalf of the associations, shall think fit."

By 1787 the leaders of the Regular and Separate Baptists of Virginia had come to feel that the differences between the two connections were too slight to offer a bar to fellowship. The advances that had been made by the Regulars some years before were now to bear a blessed fruitage. The struggle against ecclesiastical oppression for the past ten years had drawn the two parties closer

together. Negotiations to this end having no doubt preceded, the Ketokton Association sent delegates to the General Committee at its meeting in 1786, who were cordially received upon an equal footing with the rest. The question of union was considered, and the General Committee requested the different Associations to appoint delegates to attend the next General Committee, for the purpose of forming a union with the Regular Baptists. The adoption of the Philadelphia Confession by the Separates had prepared the way for such union. They had ceased to lay stress on love-feasts, laying on of hands, feet-washing, the anointing of the sick, the kiss of charity, the ceremonial devotion of children, and weekly communion. They still made a point of plainness in dress. Their undue enthusiasm in revival work had apparently been somewhat moderated and had ceased to be offensive to the Regulars. The chief difficulty in the way of union from the side of the Regulars was the guarded way in which the Confession of Faith had been adopted by the Separates and their toleration of Arminianism. Yet they were willing, in view of the distinguished piety and usefulness of the Separates, and the sacrifices and sufferings they had undergone on behalf of the faith, to fellowship them on the basis of their guarded acceptance of the Philadelphia Confession. The Separates went so far as to assert "that the doctrine of salvation by Christ and free unmerited grace alone, ought to be believed by every Christian, and maintained by every minister of the gospel." "Upon these terms," the agreement proceeds, "we are united; and desire hereafter that the names Regular and Separate be buried in oblivion; and that, from henceforth, we shall be known by the name of the *United Baptist Churches of Christ, in Virginia*." The union proved a happy and a permanent one.

A great revival of religion had begun among the Baptists of Virginia soon after the close of the war. Both parties were largely engaged in it, and the high state of spiritual life in the churches made the union possible. The revival continued with augmented power after the union. The rapidity of the increase in churches and membership during the remainder of the period is shown by the following statistics: In 1784 there were, according to the best information available, 151 churches and 14,960 members; about 1790-92 there were 218 churches and 20,443 members; about 1810-12 there were 292 churches and 35,665 members. It is estimated by Semple that fully one fourth of the Baptists of Virginia emigrated to Kentucky between 1791 and 1810. The large gain was over and above this heavy loss. At the close of this period there were nearly twice as many Baptists in Virginia as in New York, and some thousands more than in all the New England States together.

After the union of 1787 the General Committee continued to occupy itself chiefly with efforts for complete separation of church and state and the abolition and prevention of all legislation that was even constructively opposed to absolute liberty of conscience.

Steps were taken in 1788 toward publishing a history of the rise and progress of the Baptists in Virginia, and at subsequent meetings of the General Committee much attention was given to this matter. After materials had been gathered John Leland and John Williams were appointed to compile them.

The Baptists of Virginia accomplished their great work up to this time with a very moderate amount of education. They possessed a number of highly gifted men, who had surmounted the disadvantages of lack of literary and theological culture by private study; but it does not ap-

pear that they had enjoyed the services of a single college-bred man. The Separates, by way of reaction against the undue emphasis that was placed on learning by the standing order in New England, underestimated and discouraged higher education. It was a common thing among them for a recent convert with an ordinary education, or none at all, to begin at once to preach; and some of the most effective evangelists were of this type. Consumed with zeal for the newly experienced truth, they went forth among men of like culture with themselves and preached with irresistible power. But the leaders among them had begun to feel that to hold what they had achieved and to attain their high aims an educated ministry would be needful. Their attention was called to this matter in 1788 by a letter from President Manning, of Rhode Island College. It might have been expected that Manning would urge the Virginia Baptists to avail themselves of the advantages of his own institution; he urged upon them rather the importance of establishing an institution of their own. Committees were appointed from time to time, but nothing effective was accomplished for some years. In 1793 a committee reported the following plan: "That 14 trustees be appointed, all of whom shall be Baptists: That these, at their first meeting, appoint seven others of some other religious denomination: That the whole 21 then form a plan, and make arrangements for executing it." Nothing came of this action, and the Baptists of Virginia remained without an educational institution till after the close of the present period.

During the latter part of this period the Methodists, now well organized and aggressive and with their unpopular war policy well in the past, pressed hard upon the Baptists in their onward march. Semple complains that in the towns Baptists were scarcely holding their own (about

1810), while the Methodists were prospering. It is probable that this was due in part to the more popular methods and less rigorous requirements of the latter body, and in part to the excessive stress laid by many Baptist preachers on the harsher aspects of Calvinism. It was no doubt due largely to the keen rivalry of the Methodists that Arminianism found so little favor among Baptists.

The question of slavery greatly agitated the minds of some of the leaders of the denomination during this period. Struggling as they were for civil and religious liberty, they could not fail to take into consideration the bearing of their principles on this great national moral question. In 1789 the following resolution was proposed by John Leland and adopted: "Resolved, That slavery is a violent deprivation of the rights of nature, and inconsistent with a republican government, and therefore recommend it to our brethren, to make use of every legal measure to extirpate this horrid evil from the land; and pray Almighty God that our honorable legislature may have it in their power to proclaim the great Jubilee, consistent with the principles of good policy." This protest was, of course, ineffective, and the great mass of Baptists soon reconciled themselves to the existence of slavery as an institution of the land which they were powerless to abolish, but which they would do everything in their power to mitigate by humane treatment and Christian instruction. Large numbers of slave-owners became Baptists, and even those that were most in sympathy with the spirit of the above resolution felt themselves helpless. To free their slaves might have exposed them to worse evils than to retain them under gospel influences. Once recognized as under the circumstances allowable, the large property interest involved was sure, human nature being as it is, to lead Christian slave-owners to seek to justify the institution itself. For this purpose

main reliance was doubtless placed on the Old Testament, where slavery is everywhere recognized, and on the lack of prohibition in the New Testament. The fact that the New Testament exhorts slaves to be content and obedient and masters to be humane was thought to be almost equivalent to a positive permission of slavery. As the very best Baptists in the South, including many of the most prominent leaders, were slave-owners, some of them on a large scale, it is important that their point of view should be understood. The following sentence from Richard Fuller no doubt expresses the sentiment of the best Southern Baptists of his time: "I am unwilling to appear in any controversy which can even by implication place me in a false and odious attitude, representing me as the eulogist and abettor of slavery, and not as simply the apologist of an institution transmitted to us by former generations—the existence of which I lament—for the commencement of which I am not at all responsible—for the extinction of which I am willing to make greater sacrifices than any abolitionist has made, or would make, if the cause of true humanity would thus be advanced."

The General Committee, having completed its labors on behalf of civil and religious liberty, was dissolved in 1799. In 1800 its place was taken by the General Meeting of Correspondence. Considerable uneasiness had been manifested in some of the associations lest the General Committee should usurp authority belonging to the associations or to the churches. The constitution of the new body was in consequence so guarded that it had little to do. It was not until after the close of this period that it secured the hearty coöperation of the denomination and became a power in cementing union, promoting missions and education, and bringing the life of the body powerfully to bear upon the community.

In North Carolina the work of the Baptist body (first General and then Regular) gathered in the Kehukee Association, and that of the Separate body gathered in the Sandy Creek Association, extended into all parts of the State. Each association soon had many daughters. The distinction between Regular and Separate Baptists was soon abandoned here as in Virginia; yet it is probable that a more or less clearly defined type of religious life characterized the churches that sprang from each of these centers until late in the next period. The Kehukee Association was later to oppose missions, Sunday-schools, and other modern means of extending the influence of Christianity. It may be worthy of note that the Sandy Creek Association sent forth two of the noblest leaders of the early part of the next period, men who came to occupy the foremost rank in learning, eloquence, piety, and denominational influence, each to be succeeded by sons equally eminent. These were William T. Brantly and Basil Manly. Unfortunately for the Baptist cause in North Carolina, the services of these noble men were to be bestowed in other parts of the vineyard.

The rapid growth of the denomination during this period may be statistically exhibited: In 1740 there were a few small bodies of General Baptists gathered by Paul Palmer and Joseph Parker; in 1784 there were 42 churches and 3276 members; in 1792 there were 94 churches and 7503 members; in 1812 the number of churches had risen to 204, and of members to 12,567.

CHAPTER IV.

SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA.¹

THE last period closed with the Charleston Baptists in a sadly divided and depressed condition. A faction of the church had withdrawn, on Arian grounds, in 1733, and, having organized themselves as a General Baptist church, held their meetings at Stono in a house erected for Regular Baptist worship. Members of the church living on the Ashley River had withdrawn in 1736 to form a new church under the leadership of Isaac Chanler, an excellent minister from England. Pastor Tilly, of the Edisto branch of the church, died in 1744, much lamented. In the same year the church was almost wrecked by the determination of the majority to exclude the pastor, Thomas Simmons, for supposed Arian views, and the resistance offered by a minority under the lead of Francis Garcia. The majority were compelled by legal process to share the meeting-house with the heterodox minority. In June, 1745, a day of fasting and prayer was appointed by the faithful few. They signed a solemn covenant with one another and characterized themselves as "all members of the congregation of antipedobaptists, meeting in Charleston, holding the doctrine of particular election and final

¹ Cf. "Two Cent. of the First Bapt. Ch. of S. C."; Furman, "Hist. of the Charleston Assoc."; Whilden, "Oliver Hart"; Burrage; Campbell, "Geo. Baptists"; "Hist. of the Bapt. Den. in Georgia"; Benedict; Mercer, "Geo. Bapt. Assoc."; Mallary, "L. of Botsford," and "Mem. of Mercer"; and Cathcart, "Bapt. Encyc."

perseverance, and denying Arian, Arminian, and Socinian doctrines." The signers were William Screven, William Brisbane, James Screven, Thomas Dixon, William Screven, Jr., Nathaniel Bullein, James Brisbane, David Stoll, and Samuel Stillman. The descendants of the first pastor of the church were among the most active in opposition to Socinian intrusion. Samuel Stillman was probably the father of the eloquent and highly influential pastor of the First Church, Boston (1765 onward). This little band purchased a lot for £500 and the next year erected a commodious meeting-house. Just at this time the Euhaw members of this church withdrew and formed a church with Isaac Chanler as pastor. Thus the church was left almost without members simultaneously with the increase in its facilities for worship. But the tide was about to turn. Whitefield was frequently in Charleston at about this time and preached repeatedly in the Baptist meeting-house. New converts began to fill up the depleted Baptist ranks, and the church was soon to enter upon a glorious career, a career which in some respects can scarcely be paralleled.

The chief difficulty experienced at this juncture was that of securing a suitable pastor. Correspondence with brethren in England and in the Northern colonies in this behalf long proved fruitless. Elder Chanler was able during some years to preach for the church fortnightly; but his health was failing and he was the only Baptist minister in the neighborhood. Near the close of 1749 Oliver Hart, of the Philadelphia Association, came to fill the long-vacant pastorate. He arrived on the day of Elder Chanler's funeral. He was not highly educated, but was possessed of a vigorous intellect, a strong constitution, indefatigable energy, excellent judgment, and an attractive personality. He was withal deeply pious. The church felt that in his

coming their prayers had been answered. For thirty years he filled this important position and withdrew only when British occupation in 1780 made it unsafe for him to remain. He afterward became pastor at Hopewell, N. J., where he was largely useful. He was urged to return after the close of the war, but age and attachment to his new charge prevented. Under Hart's ministry the church flourished and Baptist evangelization was fostered throughout the entire region.

To Hart's influence was due the formation (1751) of the Charleston Association, on the model of the Philadelphia. It consisted at first of only four churches—the Charleston, the Ashley River, the Welsh Neck, and the Euhaw. The delegates of the latter failed to arrive. The pastor of the Ashley River church was John Stephens, also from the Philadelphia Association. Philip James, the Welsh Neck pastor, as well as the church itself, had come from the Philadelphia Association. In February, 1752, Francis Pelot became pastor of the Euhaw church, which he long served with ability and devotion. Born in Switzerland (1720) and brought up in the Reformed Church, he became a Baptist about 1744, ten years after his arrival in South Carolina. He was a man of means, being possessed of "three islands, and about 3785 acres on the continent, with slaves and stock in abundance." This notice, furnished by Morgan Edwards, is worthy of being quoted on account of the rarity of such phenomena up to this time. He was the first in a long line of wealthy Baptist ministers who administered their large estates in the fear of God and proved a blessing to the cause. From this time onward he stood shoulder to shoulder with Hart in his aggressive efforts in behalf of education and evangelization. The decisions of the Association on questions of doctrine and polity are characterized by the same moderation and

wisdom as those of the mother Association. The Philadelphia Confession of Faith was accepted as a fit expression of the views of the body. In the matter of evangelization, also, the Association followed in the footsteps of the Philadelphia. In 1755 it was decided to endeavor to raise money for the support of a missionary in the destitute parts of South Carolina and the neighboring provinces; and Hart was authorized, in case funds were forthcoming, to make an appointment. The result was that John Gano, of the Philadelphia Association, entered upon his highly successful career as a missionary. He was instructed by the Association (1756) to visit the Yadkin district, N. C., and afterward to bestow his labors wherever Providence might seem to direct. The need of educated ministers was keenly felt by the Association, and steps were taken (1756) to supply this need. The members present subscribed for the churches £133 to start an education fund, and Stephens, Hart, and Pelot were appointed trustees. The first beneficiary was Evan Pugh, appointed in 1759 on Gano's recommendation. He satisfactorily finished his studies in 1762 and was ordained. He was followed by Samuel Stillman and Edmund Botsford, both of whom proved eminently useful. The churches of the Charleston Association were from the beginning among the most liberal supporters of Rhode Island College. Hart was a personal friend of President Manning, and John Gano, who had wrought so successfully as the missionary of the Association, was an earnest advocate of the claims of the college. Gano was present at the session of 1774 as a representative of the Philadelphia Association. The needs of the college were considered, and Gano, Hart, and Pelot were requested to address the Baptist associations throughout America in favor of a plan of contributions for its support. In 1775 the churches were urged to contribute

money for the relief of Baptists in Massachusetts, who were suffering from restrictions on their religious liberties.

The Baptists of the Charleston center were enthusiastic in their support of the Revolution. The people of the interior knew little of the grounds for revolt, and many of them were disposed to be loyal to British rule. In 1775 Hart was appointed by the provincial Council of Safety to make a tour of these regions, in company with two others, to explain to the people the significance of the revolt and to gain their support. He was successful in his mission and is thought to have averted internecine war. Equally zealous was Richard Furman. Though only twenty-one years of age at the outbreak of the Revolution, and though already for two years a minister of the gospel, he entered upon military service and only retired when he was assured by those in high authority that he could more effectively serve the cause by remaining in the interior. So active was he in influencing public opinion that Lord Cornwallis offered a large reward for his apprehension. Here also the zeal of the Baptists was due in large measure to their belief that civil liberty was a condition of religious liberty.

In 1776 a meeting of representatives of the dissenting denominations was held at the High Hills of Santee, where young Furman was Baptist pastor, to deliberate as to measures for the securing of religious liberty. It is a remarkable fact that as a result of this meeting two of the pedobaptist ministers, Joseph Cook and Lewis Richards, became Baptists. These were Calvinistic Methodists, sent out under the patronage of the Countess of Huntingdon. Both proved valuable accessions.

Furman became pastor of the Charleston church in 1787, and was from this time till his death, in 1826, easily the foremost Baptist of the South and unsurpassed in denom-

inational influence by any Baptist of America. He did not enjoy the advantages of a university education, yet he applied himself with such diligence to theology, general literature, medicine, and political science as to rank among the most highly cultured men of his time. His physique corresponded accurately with the commanding and yet gentle quality of his intellect and conduct. His manners were those of a gentleman of the old school, and he continued to wear the dress of gentlemen of the later colonial time long after it had passed out of common use. Like Gano, Manning, Stillman, and other leading ministers of the time, he wore in the pulpit the gown and bands. His ample wealth and the generosity with which he used it in every good cause no doubt contributed much to his influence. His popularity was by no means confined to his own denomination. He was regarded by all as one of the foremost citizens, and was beloved for his works' sake. He was among the first and most active promoters of the Charleston Bible Society. He became interested in foreign mission work early in his ministry, and in 1805-06 was among the most zealous and successful in raising funds for the publication of the Bible translations of Carey and Marshman. He was to take a leading part in the great onward movement in the denomination following the conversion to Baptist views of Judson and Rice. His influence in inducing ill-educated ministers to gain better preparation for their work is inestimable. The high position attained by the Baptists of South Carolina was largely due to Richard Furman. Like several other noted ministers that have been referred to, he left a worthy posterity.

The Charleston Association did not grow rapidly during the first twenty years of its history. After the withdrawal of the North Carolina churches, whose connection with the Association has been referred to, the number of churches

was reduced to eight, at which point it remained until 1773. The entire membership at this date was only 390. At the meeting of 1773 Daniel Marshall and other Separate ministers were present to discuss terms of union between the two bodies, but as the Separates were tenacious of their peculiarities nothing was accomplished. They are said to have laid considerable stress on preciseness in dress and language, somewhat after the manner of the Quakers, and to have encouraged private members and women to prophesy. They were suspected of Arminian tendencies, and were regarded as unduly exclusive in refusing communion with those who rejected their peculiarities.

Far more rapid was the growth of the Separate interest. From the Sandy Creek (N. C.) center the Separate movement advanced southward from 1755 onward. When the General Association was dissolved in 1771 the churches in South Carolina, seven in number—namely, the Congaree, Fairforest, Stephen's Creek, Burch River, Mine Creek, and two named Little River—formed the Congaree Association. The work was carried forward with the usual enthusiasm and success of this type of Baptists. The Congaree Association gave place to the Bethel in 1789, owing to some difficulties that had arisen from the attempt of the body to control the action of the churches. The Broad River Association was formed in 1800 of churches belonging to the Bethel. One of the greatest revivals in the history of the Baptists of this State occurred in 1802-03. Fourteen hundred and eleven were baptized into the churches of the Bethel Association in a single year, while the new Broad River Association, whose membership had been less than 800, received during the same time 1296 by baptism. In 1803 the Saluda Association was formed by a further subdivision of the Bethel.

About 1787 the names Regular and Separate were

dropped in South Carolina as well as in Virginia and North Carolina. There was to be cleavage on the questions of missions, education, Sunday-schools, etc., but this did not follow the old lines.

In 1784 there were in South Carolina 27 churches and 1620 members; in 1792 there were 70 churches, with a membership of 4167; in 1812 the number of churches had risen to 154 and the membership to 11,325.

Georgia was not opened to British settlement till 1732. A number of English philanthropists, under the lead of General Oglethorpe, conceived the idea of making this highly fruitful and attractive land a refuge for the impoverished of Europe. In this enterprise they were encouraged by the South Carolina authorities, who were anxious to have a barrier erected between themselves and the Spaniards. Savannah was the first point to be occupied, and long continued to be the center of administration. The colony grew rapidly. A large number of Highland Scotch and Germans (persecuted Protestant Salzburgers) came over in 1736, raising the European population to 600. By 1740 over 1500 colonists had been settled, at an expense to the proprietors of more than £100,000. It was the purpose of the philanthropic projectors of the colony to exclude slavery, and as the population had been settled at heavy expense no fee-simple titles had been granted. These conditions prevented any influx of population from the older provinces. The colony failed to prosper until slavery was authorized (1749) and provision was made for valid land-titles (1750). It was stated by an English writer in 1740 that there were "descendants of the Moravian Anabaptists in the new plantation of Georgia." This is not impossible, but the Moravian Brethren were probably intended. To provide sustenance and religious training for the orphans of indi-

gent settlers, George Whitefield, in pursuance of a plan formed by John Wesley and General Oglethorpe, founded in 1740 an orphan-house, which he called "Bethesda," and for which he collected funds on his evangelistic tours throughout America and Britain. The orphanage was located a few miles south of Savannah.

There were a number of Baptists, whose names are known, among the early settlers. In 1757 Nicholas Bedgewood, Whitefield's agent at the orphanage, adopted Baptist views and was baptized by Oliver Hart into the fellowship of the Charleston church. Two years later he was ordained to the ministry. Several connected with the orphanage, including B. Stirk, were baptized by him in 1763, and the Lord's Supper was administered in the institution, to the no small annoyance of Whitefield. Bedgewood was a man of classical education and of popular gifts. He soon removed to South Carolina, where he labored for many years. Stirk removed up the Savannah River about eighteen miles, became a member of the Euhaw, S. C., church, and ministered till his death in 1770 to a few Baptists at Tuckaseeking, twenty miles farther up the river. The Baptists gathered by Stirk seem to have remained a branch of the Euhaw church.

The work at Tuckaseeking was continued in 1771 by Edmund Botsford, who had just completed a course of literary and theological training under the direction of Oliver Hart and as a beneficiary of the Education Fund of the Charleston Association. He was greatly aided and encouraged by Francis Pelot, the pastor of the Euhaw church. Botsford did not confine his labors to Tuckaseeking, but evangelized on both sides of the river from Savannah to Kiokee, north of Augusta. He devoted himself entirely to evangelistic work from 1772 onward, and many were converted under his preaching.

A still more important event in the history of Georgia Baptists was the settlement of the venerable pioneer Separate Baptist missionary, Daniel Marshall, in Columbia County, about twenty miles northwest of Augusta. This occurred in January, 1771. Marshall was now sixty-four years old and had behind him a truly apostolic record. Almost equally useful was his wife, a sister of Shubael Stearns. His son Abraham was to follow nobly in the footsteps of his parents and to become one of the most useful ministers of his time. As the Church of England had been established by law in the colony in 1758, an officious magistrate had Marshall arraigned for violation of the law. He defended himself with such unction that constable and magistrate were both deeply impressed and afterward converted.

The first Baptist church in Georgia was that founded at Kiokee (now Applington) by Daniel Marshall. This church was incorporated by the colonial authorities in 1789 as "the Anabaptist Church on Kioka."

Shortly after the organization of the Kiokee church Botsford was the guest of Colonel Barnard, the magistrate before whom Marshall had been arraigned, and was introduced by him to the venerable missionary. Botsford preached and Marshall was pleased. "I can take thee by the hand and call thee brother," he said, "for somehow I never heard *conversion* better explained in my life." Thus a fraternal relation was established between the Regular and Separate workers in Georgia that was to prove highly advantageous. Marshall died in 1784, having lived to see six Baptist churches formed in Georgia and having presided at the organization of the Georgia Association (1784).

Botsford was not ordained until March, 1773. His converts had been baptized by Marshall and the ministers of

the Charleston Association. He was abundant in labors, and so rapidly did he move from place to place that he was sometimes called the "flying preacher." He carried forward his work in Georgia with unremitting zeal until 1779. Having built up a strong church in Burke County (the Brier Creek), he founded two others and prepared the way for more. Along with Abraham Marshall and Silas Mercer, he felt obliged to flee before the British after the defeat of General Ashe at Brier Creek (March, 1779). But Daniel Marshall, hero that he was, stood at his post, nothing daunted. He was instant in season and out of season. At musters or races, in the open field, in the market-place, in the army, or in the home, he was always ready to proclaim salvation through a crucified Redeemer, and multitudes heeded his earnest words. One of the chief means by which Marshall was so largely successful in evangelization was the encouragement and employment of lay preaching. A large number of young men, most of whom became useful ministers, were licensed to preach and were ready to assume pastorates as new churches were organized. Of this number were Silas Mercer and Abraham Marshall.

Before the beginning of the war (1776) there were three (possibly four) churches in Georgia: Kiokee (1772); Botsford's (1773); Red's Creek (1774). There was a church on Buckhead Creek organized before or during the war. It became extinct, its loyalist pastor, Matthew Moore, having left the country. Two churches were organized during the war: Little Brier Creek (1777) and Fishing Creek (1782). These were all in the neighborhood of Augusta.

The formation of the Georgia Association (preliminary meeting, October, 1784; first meeting for business, May, 1785) was an event of first importance in the history of

Georgia Baptists. It was soon to become one of the strongest and most influential bodies in the denomination, and its record has been in every way a most honorable one. During the earlier time (till 1791) it held two sessions each year.

When the Association was organized (1784) there were only six Baptist churches in Georgia. From this time onward the growth of the denomination was rapid and steady. In Wilkes County twenty-two churches were formed between 1784 and 1790. Silas Mercer was the leader, but he had the enthusiastic support of a large number of licentiates, some of whom were ordained before the latter date. Mercer was a somewhat stern doctrinal preacher, but he carried conviction wherever he went and multitudes were converted through his ministry. He was, after Daniel Marshall's death, the leader of the churches of the Association. But he is best known as the father of Jesse Mercer, whose name will ever be treasured by Georgia Baptists. One of the most amiable, laborious, and successful ministers of this time was Abraham Marshall. Born in 1748, before his father left New England on his wonderful missionary tour southward, he was baptized when twenty-two years of age and at once began to preach. Until 1784 he itinerated almost constantly. He succeeded his father in the pastorate of the Kiokee church, yet continued to travel much as an evangelist.

The Association having by 1794 increased to fifty-six churches (of which four or more were in South Carolina), a division was deemed advisable and the Hepzibah Association was formed. This included most of the churches in Richmond, Burke, Jefferson, Warren, and Washington counties. The Sarepta Association, formed in 1799, was a second offshoot from the Georgia and included the churches of Oglethorpe, Elbert, and Franklin counties.

The first colored Baptist church in Georgia was organized in Savannah, with the help of Abraham Marshall, in 1788. The church was gathered through the labors of George Leile (or Sharp), a remarkable colored man, who had been converted in Burke County about 1774 through the preaching of Matthew Moore, the loyalist already mentioned. Leile fled to Jamaica at the close of the war. One of his converts, Andrew Bryan, took up the work. These colored Baptists were cruelly persecuted, and displayed considerable heroism in their devotion to the faith. By 1788 persecution had ceased. In four years the membership had risen from eighty to two hundred and fifty, while there were three hundred and fifty others who were applicants for membership. Nearly all the churches doubtless had a considerable contingent of colored members at this time.

The close of the century was a period of marked depression in denominational life and work. A number of the earlier leaders had passed away, and inactivity and discouragement had followed the great revivals of the earlier time. A new set of men, better educated and abler than those of the past, were now coming forward and would lead the denomination to still nobler achievements. The most prominent of these were Henry Holcombe, Joseph Clay, and Jesse Mercer.

Holcombe was born in Virginia in 1762, but was brought up in South Carolina. He became a cavalry officer before he was twenty-one. Converted at twenty-two, he began at once to exhort others to flee from the wrath to come. His first sermon was preached on horseback to his troops. Led to Baptist views by a study of the New Testament, he rode twenty miles to get himself baptized. He so impressed his views on his own and his wife's family that several of them became Baptists. He was or-

dained to the ministry in 1785 and soon took his place among the foremost preachers of the State. He was a member of the convention that approved the United States Constitution. After serving the Euhaw church for some time he was prevailed upon to undertake work in Savannah, where a number of Baptists resided and various efforts had been ineffectively made to found a Baptist church. The Charleston church had taken a deep interest in the cause at Savannah and had assisted in building a meeting-house (1795). This had been rented to an independent Presbyterian congregation, who joined with the Baptists in inviting Holcombe. The congregation must have been a wealthy one, for Holcombe received a salary of \$2000 a year, probably the largest ever received by a Baptist minister up to that time. A Baptist church consisting of ten members besides himself and wife was organized in November, 1800. By 1802 the membership had increased to sixty and the Presbyterians withdrew. Among the members were the widow of Lieutenant-Governor Jones and Judge Joseph Clay. Holcombe remained in this position until 1811, when he accepted a call to Philadelphia. As pulpit orator, writer, organizer, and originator of schemes for the advancement of the denominational work, he deserves to be placed side by side with his friend Richard Furman as one of the ablest men of his time. Like Furman, he had a magnificent physique, being six feet two inches in height, and weighing three hundred pounds. He is said to have originated the Georgia penitentiary system and to have led in founding the Savannah Female Orphan Asylum. He was among the first to advocate and plan for concerted denominational action in education and missions. He was the moving spirit in the founding of Mount Enon Academy for the education of Baptist youth. He seems to have been the first among

American Baptists to publish a religious periodical (the "Analytical Repository," 1802-03).

Mention has already been made of Jesse Mercer as the worthy son of Silas Mercer. During the first decade of the century he stood side by side with Holcombe in his advocacy of education, missions, and concerted denominational action, and after the departure of Holcombe he was for years the recognized leader of the progressive element of the denomination. Born in North Carolina in 1769, he was brought by his parents to Wilkes County, Ga., when an infant. In 1787 he was baptized by his father and, after the manner of the Separate Baptists of that time, began almost immediately to labor for the salvation of souls. Before he had completed his twentieth year he was ordained to the ministry. He secured such education as was at that time available in this newly settled country, and through the industrious application of his strong intellect became an able theologian. His career as editor of a denominational paper, promoter of the State Convention, and leader in the establishment and endowment of Mercer University, falls in the next period.

No worthier name appears on the records of this period than that of the Hon. Joseph Clay. He was a son of a Revolutionary colonel of the same name, who had been a member of the Continental Congress (1778-80) and had held other high positions. Converted to Baptist views under the ministry of Henry Holcombe, he left his high judicial position to become a humble Baptist minister. He was baptized and licensed in 1802 and ordained in 1804. He served ably as a member of the General Committee for a number of years and in 1807 was called to succeed Stillman as pastor of the First Church, Boston. He was a graduate of Princeton College. As a member of the Georgia Constitutional Convention of 1798 he had

the honor of drafting the revised constitution. He died in 1811, in the forty-seventh year of his age.

The Savannah Association was formed in 1802, under Holcombe's direction, and consisted at first of Holcombe's Savannah church, the colored Savannah church, and the Newington church, twenty miles up the river. Two other colored churches were added in 1803. The membership of the white churches was eighty-four, while that of the colored churches was eight hundred and fifty.

In view of the languishing condition of denominational life already referred to, leading brethren, after consultation, called a Conference at Powelton (1801), where Jesse Mercer was pastor. Steps were taken for the supplying of destitute churches and for opening up new fields by the employment of missionaries. In the years of fresh enthusiasm church extension had gone forward spontaneously, but the time had come when deliberate planning and concerted action were necessary. The Methodists, organized and aggressive, were in the field, and Baptists must organize or be left far behind. Steps were taken, also, toward the evangelization of the Indians. At this meeting it was proposed that "a General Committee of the Georgia Baptists should be formed, consisting of three members from each Association in the State, the leading object of which should be, to meet and confer with other Christian societies, in order to remove differences, and, if possible, bring about a more general and close union among real Christians on the principles of eternal truth."

The General Committee was constituted by the favorable action of the Associations and held its first meeting at Powelton, April 30, 1803. It issued an address "to the Baptist Associations, and all gospel ministers, not of their order, within this State," signed by Abraham Marshall as chairman and Henry Holcombe as secretary. The first

part of the document is an effort to remove the objections that had been raised in the Associations to the constitution of the General Committee, and is a strong plea for united action. The committee is spoken of as "a bond of union, center of intelligence, and advisory council to the Baptists of this State." "The leading object of this Committee is to advance your general interests by drawing your lights to a focus and giving unity, consistency, and, consequently, energy and effect to your exertions in the cause of God. With a steady view to an object so desirable and important, we trust that converted individuals, unconnected with any religious society, and of our denominational sentiments, will join themselves to our churches; that the churches will punctually support their representatives in the Associations; and that these venerable bodies will appear by three delegates from each at the time and place appointed for the meeting of this Committee. In that case the seats which we have the honor to fill, as the Committee of the late Conference, we shall most cheerfully resign to your delegates; but so essential to the Baptist interests in this State do we deem the General Committee, that, should there be a deficiency in your representation, we are bound, as appears by our Minutes, to supply it by the method which may appear most eligible."

Since the first meeting of the Conference in 1801 there had been a great religious awakening, and this was attributed in some measure to the activity of the Conference. The second session of the Conference (1802) had taken steps toward a general union; the third session (1803) matured the plan for formal presentation to the Associations, reserving the right to continue the organized efforts for concerted denominational action whether the Associations should approve or disapprove.

The second part of the document, addressed to "all

gospel ministers, not of our order," is significant of the broad-mindedness of the members of the Conference and their earnest aspirations after Christian union. It reads as follows: "Reverend Brethren: We are assured by revelation, and have the happiness to *feel*, that all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity make but one family. If of this description, our Father, our elder Brother, and the Spirit that is given us, are the same; and the same our hopes, our fears, our desires, our aversions, our sorrows, and our pleasures. Whenever we act like aliens toward each other, it is because we are disguised by our imperfections, or misrepresented by our adversaries. Impressed with these sentiments, we shall be happy to see you all, or any of you, at our next meeting, that we may enjoy the opportunity, in our public capacity, of evincing to you and to the world our sincere disposition and earnest desire to cultivate and maintain friendship and fellowship, not only with you, but with all the true followers of Jesus Christ of your respective denominations. . . . We are cordially willing to add, in conjunction with you, our best endeavors to remove every obstacle to our communion at that board which, we trust, will be succeeded by an infinitely richer banquet in our Father's house. With the greatest respect and affection, we invite you, Reverend Brethren, to an investigation, in order to a Scriptural adjustment of the comparatively small points in which we differ."

This union plank of the platform of the Conference was looked upon with suspicion by many and proved an obstacle to the cordial coöperation of the Associations. Nothing seems to have come of it, as it is not likely that the members of the Conference themselves were willing to surrender any of their denominational tenets, and it was scarcely to be expected that the pedobaptists would all at once, in response to such overtures, abandon what Bap-

tists have ever regarded as an unscriptural and unwarranted practice. Two Episcopal and two Methodist ministers were present at the meeting of 1804, but not in any representative capacity. Yet the committee resolved "to continue their sincere efforts to promote" Christian union "by all means consistent with the rights of conscience and a plain declaration of the whole revealed counsel of God."

Christian education occupied almost the entire attention of this session of the General Committee. It was unanimously resolved to take immediate measures for establishing a literary institution to be denominated "The Baptist College of Georgia," and a committee of five was appointed to secure from the legislature a charter for the incorporation of the General Committee as "The Trustees of the Baptist College of Georgia." A circular letter on "The Importance of Education" was addressed to the churches.

The effort to secure a charter was unsuccessful, but at the next meeting of the General Committee it was "resolved unanimously, that the Committee would persevere in their efforts to establish a college or seminary of learning for the education of youth of every denomination, though they should never obtain the slightest legislative aid."

The Circular Address of 1805, drafted by Jesse Mercer, is a document of great interest. The first part is an explanation of the committee's position on the communion question: "Though to commune at the Lord's table with all the truly gracious is desirable in the extreme, and though it is the duty of all ministers to exert themselves to lead all the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus in *the unity* of the Spirit and *the bonds of peace*, yet it should seem that this duty must be discharged with a truly pious and inflexible regard to the purity, sufficiency, and unity

of the gospel. That no unrighteous compact be formed, *directly* or *indirectly*, with unbelievers or the Sons of Belial, that violence be practiced on no ordinance or doctrine of God's holy Word, and that proper measures should be adopted and pursued till all the churches of the saints be freed from all those superstitious innovations, human traditions, and vile hypocrisies which have been so long the disgrace of their solemn Assemblies, and still are the baneful sources of that unhappy difference which now wards off the desired communion. *This done*, and communion will instantly follow in beautiful, sweet, and desirable succession; but *this not done*, and we are obliged to think that it would be undesirable and destructive."

The effort to secure a charter and the incorporation of the committee seems to have been misunderstood or misrepresented by some brethren as an attempt to establish the Baptist form of religion by law. The utter incongruity of such a supposition is ably shown in the Address: "Such a measure adopted by the Baptists would set them in direct opposition to their openly avowed, most sacred and distinguishing principles of faith; and also cast the most undeserved contempt upon that temper and disposition of mind which so long, without variation or abatement, distinguished them as the zealous advocates of Civil and Religious Liberty. When things are placed in this light, it is evident that, except we could dishonor ourselves, depose the church, subvert religion, and desert the divine will, we cannot have any clandestine views in contemplation." It is evident that in their efforts to elevate the denomination to the height of its privileges the General Committee had a large amount of Baptist ignorance and bigotry to contend with.

The educational policy of the committee is next vindicated. "It has been thought we are adopting measures

to establish in our church—in particular—a learned ministry.” The Address proceeds to show that the evils of an educated ministry have been due not to the education but to other causes. There was a widespread fear among Baptists at this time lest a man-made ministry should take the place of a Spirit-impelled ministry. The Address claims that if the circumstances that have tended to substitute education for piety “could be detached, learning would immediately shine forth in its native luster and intrinsic worth, tending to the better state of society in general. To that part of this work which belongs to the divine agency, we make no pretensions; but so far as learning will tend to the removal of ignorance, prejudice, and presumption, so far it is ours, and should be attended to with promptitude and perseverance. . . . The proposed college is not, therefore, designed for the education of our children, nor is this seat of learning one in which young men already in the ministry *shall*, but *may be*, further taught in some proper degree. But it is to be viewed as a civil institution to be religiously guarded and conducted for the better education of the rising generation and common interests of morality and religion. . . . That we have it in our power to do good in no way to greater advantage than by establishing some lasting source of knowledge and moral virtue is a certain truth. To hand down to the next generation a number of young men both moral and sensible must not fail to awaken the warmest desires and provoke the best endeavors of all well-disposed parents.”

In 1806 the General Committee detached itself from the Associations, became a close corporation with power to fill vacancies, and took measures for the establishment of Mount Enon College on a beautiful sand-hill in Richmond County between the Savannah and Ogeechee rivers.

Holcombe, who presented the property, guaranteed the sale of \$2600 worth of building lots, thus creating a fund for the erection of buildings.

The committee decided this year to "appoint two agents—one to preach on the western frontier of the State and visit the Creek Nation with reference to the establishment of a school as the germ of a mission there; and the other to make a preaching tour throughout the United States to solicit funds to aid in establishing Mount Enon College."

The General Committee as it was reconstructed at this time consisted of Benjamin Brooks, Joseph Clay, Lewis C. Davis, Stephen Gafford, Henry Holcombe, Abraham Marshall, James Matthews, Jesse Mercer, Benjamin Moseley, Thomas Polhill, Thomas Rhodes, and Charles O. Screven. Holcombe was appointed president, Mercer vice-president, Polhill secretary, and B. S. Screven treasurer. C. O. Screven, a grandson of the father of South Carolina Baptists, was appointed president of the college. While refusing to grant a university charter, the legislature incorporated the trustees of the academy. The institution failed to receive adequate denominational support. The location proved to be unsuitable, and several schools of similar grade were soon afterward opened at various points. It did not long survive Dr. Holcombe's removal to Philadelphia (1811). But the agitation that had resulted in its establishment was not in vain. A large part of the denomination had been convinced that education could not safely or righteously be neglected. Experience had been gained which would prove invaluable in the inauguration and management of the later educational enterprises that were to result in the establishment of Mercer University. The application for a charter was doubtless premature. The legislature rightly withheld a

charter until the denomination should show itself capable of founding and sustaining a worthy institution and especially until the denomination as such should express a desire for a charter. The work of the General Committee was of the utmost value, not simply for what it actually accomplished, but because it prepared the way for concerted denominational action. The State Convention of a later time, with its highly beneficent activities, was a result.

The Baptists of Georgia were little disturbed by doctrinal dissension. About 1786 Jeremiah Walker, who had been a leading advocate of Arminianism among the Virginia Separate Baptists, and who had been deposed from the ministry for misconduct but afterward restored, appeared among the Baptists of Georgia and by his eloquence and ability soon gained considerable influence. In his attempt to promulgate Arminian views he had the support of David Tinsley, who had suffered imprisonment with him in Virginia for fidelity to Baptist principles, Matthew Talbot, and Nathaniel Hall. They were opposed by the great mass of the denomination, and after earnest efforts had been made to win them from error they were duly excommunicated. Walker died shortly afterward, and the Arminian movement practically died with him. The intrusion of Arminian teaching at this time was looked upon as all the more to be deprecated from the fact that the Methodists were pressing into the State. Two South Carolina churches that belonged to the Georgia Association followed Hall in his Arminianism and formed a separate Association which continued for a number of years.

The case of James Hutchinson, whose immersion by a Methodist minister had been accepted by the Georgia Baptists but repudiated by the Baptists of Virginia,

caused considerable embarrassment, and it was the opinion of the Georgia Baptist leaders that a serious mistake had been made in the matter.

As has already appeared, the Baptists of Georgia were attentive to the spiritual needs of the colored population, and the colored churches and their pastors were treated with the utmost courtesy and consideration. By 1810 the population of Georgia had reached 252,432, of whom 145,414 were slaves. A number of large churches had been built up by the labors of colored preachers, encouraged by their white brethren; and most of the white churches had large numbers of colored members. One of the most noted of the colored ministers was Andrew Bryan, of Savannah. In 1812 the Savannah Association adopted the following minute: "The Association is sensibly affected by the death of the Rev. Andrew Bryan, a man of color, and pastor of the First Colored Church in Savannah. This son of Africa, after suffering inexpressible persecutions in the cause of his divine Master, was at length permitted to discharge the duties of the ministry among his colored friends in peace and quiet, hundreds of whom, through his instrumentality, were brought to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. He closed his extensively useful and amazingly luminous course in the lively exercise of faith, and in the joyful hope of a happy immortality." Equally eminent and respected were Andrew Marshall, of Savannah, and Jacob Walker, of Augusta. It is said that at the death of the latter "the whole city of Augusta manifested the greatest respect and sorrow, as for one of its most eminent citizens."

The period closed in the midst of one of the greatest religious awakenings ever known in Georgia. Nearly all the Baptist pastors turned evangelists, and with wonderful enthusiasm covered the State with their missionary activ-

ity. Churches were springing up everywhere, and the denomination was ready to enter at once upon the great advance movement to which Providence was pointing by the conversion of Judson and Rice.

The six churches of 1784 had a membership of 428. In 1792 there were 50 churches and 3211 members. The number of ministers reported was 72. This includes licentiates or helpers, and shows a state of great religious activity in the churches.

In 1813 there were five Associations (the Ocmulgee, not previously mentioned, was formed in 1810 by a further division of the Georgia), containing 164 churches and 15,755 members.

CHAPTER V.

KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, OHIO, INDIANA, ILLINOIS,
MISSOURI, MISSISSIPPI, AND LOUISIANA.¹

THE planting of Baptist churches in Kentucky and Tennessee was virtually an extension of the field of the Baptists of Virginia and North Carolina. As these new and fertile regions were opened up for settlement thousands of Baptists from the older communities were among the pioneers. Naturally they formed churches wherever enough Baptists were within reach of one another.

Among the earliest explorers of Kentucky were Daniel Boone and his brother, Squire Boone. The latter was a Baptist, as were also several members of the great pioneer's family. Boonesborough was settled in 1775, the Boones having been joined by Colonel Richard Calloway and his family, likewise Baptists. Early in 1776 Thomas Tinsley and William Hickman, Baptist ministers, settled at Harrodsburg. Within the next few years a large number of Baptists came into this land of promise, among them General Henry Crist, General Aquila Whitaker, General Joseph Lewis, Colonel Robert Johnson, Colonel William Bush, Hon. James Garrard, Gabriel Slaughter, and the Clays. Most of these titles were probably gained at a later date. Several other Baptist ministers settled in the new territory in 1779-80, among them William Marshall, John Whitaker,

¹ Cf. Benedict; Paxton; "Bapt. Memorial" (various articles, especially those by J. M. Peck); and Duncan.

Benjamin Lynn, John Garrard, and Joseph Barnett. Garrard is the minister who came to Virginia from the Philadelphia Association about 1755 and who was so largely useful in building up the churches of the Ketokton Association. A number of other Virginia ministers visited Kentucky at this time and sought to awaken the people to a sense of their obligation to attend to the gathering of churches and the evangelization of the country. But the people were so taken up with clearing the ground and protecting themselves from Indians that they were little disposed to enter upon aggressive Christian work.

The first Baptist church organized was that still known as Severn's Valley (June, 1781). Joseph Barnett and John Garrard were the ministers present. In July following the same ministers constituted the Cedar Creek church, forty miles southeast of Louisville. In the autumn of the same year a church, with its pastor, Lewis Craig, removed from Spottsylvania County, Va., and settled on Gilbert's Creek. The Forks of Dix Creek church was organized in 1782; Providence, South Elkhorn, and Gilbert's Creek (Separate Baptist) in 1783; and Beargrass in 1784. In 1785 there was a revival which resulted in the formation of nine additional churches. Most of the Baptist immigrants were from Virginia, but a few families came from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the Carolinas.

Three Associations were formed in 1785—two of Regular Baptists, Elkhorn and Salem; and one of Separate Baptists, the South Kentucky. From this time onward the growth of the denomination, like the growth of the population of the territory, was exceedingly rapid. About a fourth of the Baptists of Virginia found new homes in Kentucky.

In 1793 an effort was made to bring about an amalgamation of Regular and Separate Baptists, such as had already

taken place in Virginia and North Carolina. But the Regulars were probably rather extreme in their Calvinism and inclined to lay too much stress on the acceptance of the Confession of Faith, while the Separates had an aversion for confessions and some of them a leaning toward Arminianism. Those churches of both parties that were eager for union withdrew and formed an Association of "United Baptists" (the Tate's Creek).

From 1793 to the end of the century was a period of spiritual dearth. Infidelity and immorality increased at an alarming rate. But in 1800 and the following years the entire State was stirred by the greatest revival in its history. Presbyterians and Methodists were by this time on the field, and these participated in the Great Awakening. Phenomena of the most distressing kind attended the revival meetings of all denominations. Peculiar nervous conditions accompanied strong religious conviction. What was known as the "jerks" was common, and those awakened sometimes barked and sometimes danced. The Baptist membership in the State was doubled by this awakening.

As Regulars and Separates alike participated in this movement they were naturally drawn nearer to each other in sympathy and love, and terms of union were finally agreed upon in 1801. The short confession that formed the basis of union asserts the final perseverance of the saints and allows the preaching of the doctrine that Christ tasted death for every man. Most of the articles are so general that Arminians and Calvinists might agree in accepting them. Freedom is allowed to each party to continue its associational and church arrangements.

John Gano, who in his early ministry had labored with such zeal and success in the Carolinas and Virginia, and since 1762 had been pastor of the First Church, New York,

removed to Kentucky in 1788, somewhat broken in health, but ready for years of noble service. He died in 1804.

In 1784 there were only 6 churches in the State, with a membership of something over 400; by 1792 the number of churches had increased to 42 and that of members to 3095; by 1812 the churches numbered 285 and the members 22,694. The population, which in 1775 was almost nothing, had increased to 73,677 by 1790, and by 1810 to 406,511.

The early Baptists of Kentucky were, as a rule, thoroughly imbued with prejudice against educated and salaried ministers. The experience of early Virginia Baptists in being taxed for the support of irreligious and vicious clergymen, whose only recommendation was that they had received a university education, led them to look with suspicion upon the highly educated and to prefer a ministry from the ranks of the people earning a support by following secular pursuits. These sentiments became intensified in Kentucky, where for a long time educational facilities were almost wanting.

There were Baptists in Eastern Tennessee soon after 1765, and two churches are said to have been organized. They were driven out by the Indians in 1774. No particulars have been preserved. About 1780 a large number of Baptists, with eight or ten ministers, removed from Virginia and North Carolina to the Holston country in Eastern Tennessee. A colony from the old Sandy Creek church of North Carolina settled on Boone's Creek. Five or six churches having been gathered by 1781, it was arranged that they should meet together twice a year in Conference. They remained members of the Sandy Creek Association until 1786, when it was thought best to organize the Holston Association. Most of these Baptists were of the Separate variety, but there was no doctrinal discord

and the Philadelphia Confession was adopted. By 1802, as a result of further immigration and especially of the great revival of the preceding two years, the Association had added twenty-nine churches to its original seven, and had a membership of about twenty-five hundred. The Tennessee Association was formed in 1803 by a division of the Holston.

The Cumberland region (Middle Tennessee) began to be settled in 1780. It is probable that some Baptists were in the first company of three hundred led by General James Robertson. In 1791 Ambrose Dudley and John Taylor, of Kentucky, traveled two hundred miles through the wilderness to aid in organizing the Tennessee church at the mouth of the Sulphur Fork River. It united with the Elkhorn Association. There was no other church within one hundred miles of the Tennessee until the White's Creek church was formed in 1794. A church organized in North Carolina was transplanted to the head of the Sulphur Fork in 1795. Their pastor was Joseph Dorris, who became the cause of much trouble to the church and the Association. Two other churches had been formed by 1796, one of them out of fragments of an older church scattered by the Indians in 1774. The five united in forming the Mero Association in 1797. Early in the present century charges against the character of Dorris were brought before the Association. After many efforts to solve the difficulties involved without a division, the Association was disbanded and those who adhered to Dorris were left out of the new Cumberland Association that took its place (1803). This region seems to have shared largely in the great revival of the early part of the century. By 1806 the Cumberland Association had increased to thirty-nine churches, and its territory had become so extensive that a division was thought advisable.

The Red River Association was the result. A third Association, the Concord, was formed in 1810 by a further division of the Cumberland. It prospered greatly for a time, nearly nine hundred having been added to its membership in 1812; but serious divisions on doctrine almost wrecked it a few years later. The Elk River Association was formed in 1806 and had grown to be a vigorous body by 1812.

The economic and social conditions were much the same in Tennessee as in Kentucky. The land was fertile, but had to be laboriously brought into cultivation, and Indians were numerous and ferocious. Educational advantages were of the poorest, and the same causes were operative here as in Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina to create a deep-seated aversion to educated and salaried ministers. The missionary and educational movement of the next period was to find in Tennessee some of its most determined opponents.

The growth of the denomination in Tennessee during this period may be illustrated by the following statistics: In 1784 there were 6 churches, with less than 400 members; in 1792 there were 21 churches and about 900 members; by 1812 the churches had increased to 156 and the membership to 11,325.

Ohio was settled late in the present period, but Baptists were early on the ground. In 1789 a number of Baptist families from Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey formed a settlement on the Little Miami at Columbia, now within the limits of Cincinnati. Among these were Isaac Ferris, from Connecticut, Judge Goforth and General John Gano, from New York, and Benjamin and Elijah Stites, from New Jersey. Gano was a son of the famous preacher. There was no minister in the company, but the brethren took turns in conducting the services. In 1790 Stephen

Gano, pastor of the First Church, Providence, and brother of the general, visited the settlement, baptized three converts, and assisted in organizing the first evangelical church north of the Ohio River. The first pastor of the church was John Smith, who afterward became a member of the United States Senate. By 1797 three other churches had sprung up in the neighborhood: Miami Island, Carpenter's Run, and Clear Creek. These four united at this time in forming the Miami Association. Turtle Creek and Little Prairie churches soon joined the Association. The other pastors were Peter Smith, James Lee, and Daniel Clarke. Joshua Carman and Josiah Dodge, from Kentucky, were present when the Association was formed. The ministry was soon reinforced by the accession of John Sutton, Joshua Carman, and John Mason, the two last from Kentucky. As the Columbia church became speedily the mother of churches, so the Miami Association became the mother of Associations.

In 1801 a Baptist church of German extraction removed from Shenandoah County, Va., to the Scioto River district in Ohio. They settled at Pleasant Run, near Lancaster. In 1809 the church had three ministers, named Stites, Comer, and Coiman, who could conduct services in both German and English. At about the same date a company of Baptists from New England formed a church at Ames. This church united with the Pleasant Run (1805) in forming the Scioto Association.

The remaining Associations formed during this period are the Muskingum (1811) and the Mad River (1812). These resulted from a subdivision of the Miami, whose churches had become too numerous and widespread conveniently to assemble.

The Baptist life of Ohio was more heterogeneous than that in most of the other newly opened territories, and

considerable discord was to be expected. The advance movement of the succeeding period was to meet with less opposition here than in some of the States. This was due in part, no doubt, to the fact that in the settlement of the country the New England and Middle States were in the ascendancy.

In 1790 Ohio had 2 Baptist churches and 64 members; in 1812, 60 churches and 2400 members were reported.

Indiana received its earliest Baptist population from Kentucky and Ohio about 1797. A church, afterward known as the Silver Creek, was organized about 1798 (so "Bapt. Encyc.," vol. i., p. 575; but Peck, in Benedict, 864, gives 1802). The minister to whose labors the gathering of the church was due was Isaac Edwards, a native of New Jersey. William McCoy, of Kentucky, had previously given much labor to this region. The son of the latter, Isaac McCoy, was one of the most useful ministers in Indiana during the latter part of this period and the early years of the next.

The first churches formed in the Wabash region were the Wabash and the Bethel (1806). The Patoka and the Salem churches followed in 1808, and the Maria Creek in 1809. The Wabash District Association was organized in 1808. The churches on the Whitewater had at first held associational relations with the Miami Association of Ohio. In 1809 the Whitewater Association was formed. The Silver Creek Association began its career in 1812 with eight churches and a membership of two hundred and seventy. There was little to distinguish the early Indiana Baptists from those of Kentucky and Ohio, from whom they were chiefly derived. The modern movement, with its missions, education, Sunday-schools, etc., was to find some of its most inveterate opponents in this new State.

In 1812 there were in the whole of Indiana 29 churches and 1726 members.

Illinois was not opened to settlement till after 1778. The first Protestant settlers are said to have been Baptists. In 1786 a number of families from Virginia and Kentucky occupied the American Bottom and the hill-country of Monroe County. It appears that none of these had been members of Baptist churches, but they observed the Lord's Day, trained their children, and held meetings for worship. In 1787, and afterward, they were visited by James Smith, a Kentucky Baptist minister, who did good service. On one of his visits he was captured by Indians and had to be ransomed at heavy cost. In 1794 Josiah Dodge, of Kentucky, visited Illinois and baptized a number of persons, but organized no church. The first church in this territory was constituted in 1796 by David Badgeley, who had just removed with his family from Virginia. It was called the New Design church and had twenty-eight constituent members. Fifteen of these had just been baptized as a result of evangelistic meetings, in which Badgeley had been assisted by Joseph Chance.

By 1807 four other churches had been organized—the Mississippi Bottom, the Richland, the Wood River, and the Silver Creek. At this time they united in forming the Illinois Union Association. Two years later difficulties arose with reference to correspondence with Kentucky Associations in which slavery prevailed. Those opposed to holding fellowship with slave-holders withdrew, adopted the designation "Friends to Humanity," and organized the South District Association on an anti-slavery basis.

The Wabash District Association (1809) contained a number of Illinois churches along with those belonging to Indiana, and later the Illinois element preponderated.

In 1812 there were in Illinois 7 churches and 153 members.

Missouri was the name given in 1812 to the large territory, previously known as Upper Louisiana, ceded by France to the United States in 1804. It embraced what has been subdivided into Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and much besides. During the Spanish and French régime Roman Catholicism was the only form of Christianity tolerated; but a few Protestants had slipped in with the connivance of the authorities. Among these were a number of Baptists. In fact, Baptists seem to have been the very first to carry evangelical religion beyond the Mississippi. Thomas Bull, his wife, and her mother, Mrs. Lee, settled in Cape Girardeau County in 1796. In 1797 Enos Randal and wife and Mrs. Abernathy made their homes a few miles south of Jackson. No Baptist minister visited the region until 1799, when Thomas Johnson, of Georgia, who had devoted much of his life to mission work among the Cherokee Indians, regardless of the law preached to small but eager gatherings. He baptized a Mrs. Ballou and gave her a certificate of baptism. After 1804 there was a great influx of population from the southwestern States and Territories. In 1805 David Green, a Virginian who had labored for years in the Carolinas and Kentucky, visited the Baptist settlements of Missouri, but soon afterward returned to Kentucky. A strong conviction having seized him that he ought to minister to the neglected Missouri settlers, he removed to Cape Girardeau County and during the few years that remained to him (he died in 1809) was instrumental in laying the foundations for Baptist work. The Tywappity Bottom church, with eight or ten members, was constituted by him in 1805, and the Bethel church, with fifteen members, in 1806. The former became extinct after a few years; the latter became the

fruitful mother of churches. The Bethel chapel was the first evangelical place of worship erected in Missouri. The church in Jackson is properly the continuation of the old Bethel church, which was a mile and a half away. The remnant, after the withdrawal of members to form the Jackson and other churches, became anti-missionary and died.

Among the earliest settlers of the St. Louis district (1796-97) were several of the children and other relatives of Daniel Boone, who were Baptists. In 1803 (or 1804) Thomas R. Musick, a Virginian Baptist minister, removed with a large party of relatives and others to this region. Three settlements were formed: one near the Spanish Pond, another between Bridgeton and Florissant, and a third on Fee Fee's Creek. Elder Musick was the first Regular Baptist minister to settle in the St. Louis district. He had visited Missouri as early as 1801, being at that time resident in Kentucky. He was a man full of zeal and good works. From the fact that he spent considerable time in teaching it may be inferred that he had a fair education. The Fee Fee's Creek church was organized under his ministry in 1807, and the Cold Water church in 1809. Shortly before Musick's first visit to Missouri that somewhat eccentric but devoted and indefatigable evangelist, John Clark, visited the St. Louis district (1798). Clark was a well-educated Scotchman (born November, 1758). Removing to Georgia about 1786, he was converted in Methodist meetings, and in 1791 was received on trial as a preacher. In 1794 he was ordained deacon. Becoming dissatisfied with Methodist church polity he severed his connection with the denomination and in 1796 left on foot for Kentucky. From Kentucky he went to Illinois, everywhere preaching the word. He frequently visited Missouri. About 1803 he had become convinced that believers are the only proper subjects of baptism and that

immersion is the only authorized mode. A like-minded independent Methodist brother and he immersed each other and thus became independent Baptists. He traveled almost constantly, nearly always on foot. Having been presented with a horse by well-disposed friends, he soon asked to be relieved of it. To meet his appointments he would wade and swim swollen streams. No sort of weather was a bar to his progress. He formed a number of societies during the last decade of this period which afterward became Baptist.

By 1812 there were in Missouri 7 Baptist churches, with a membership of 192. No Association had as yet been formed.

The territory now comprised in Mississippi received its first Baptist settlers from South Carolina and Georgia in 1780. In the same year the Salem church on Cole's Creek, southeast of Natchez, was constituted. Among these early settlers were the large Curtis family and their connections. They had been driven from their homes by the British and their loyalist neighbors, and their journey had been most difficult and perilous. Richard Curtis, Jr., was a licensed preacher, and with considerable misgiving administered the ordinances. John and Jacob Stampley both became ministers.

Among the early converts was a Spanish Catholic, Stephen d'Alvoy. The Spanish authorities made no serious efforts to interfere with the Baptists until 1793-94, when, owing to somewhat imprudent denunciations of Roman Catholicism on the part of some of their leaders, Curtis was arrested and brought before the Spanish commandant. He was dismissed with the threat of deportation of himself and other leaders to the mines of Mexico in case they should persist in violating the law. In 1795 it was ordered that "if nine persons were found worship-

ing together, except according to the forms of the Catholic Church, they should suffer imprisonment." An effort was made in 1795 to arrest Curtis and D'Alvoy, but they escaped to South Carolina, where they remained about two and a half years, and where Curtis was ordained. Other Baptists were imprisoned and otherwise maltreated. After Curtis's departure the field was visited by Elder Mulkey (probably the noted Philip Mulkey, of North Carolina). An effort of the authorities to arrest him led to resistance on the part of the congregation, who armed themselves and proceeded to the fort to demand immunity from persecution.

The territory was ceded to the United States in 1797. Curtis returned to his church, and thenceforward the work advanced without civil interference. In 1798 a second church was formed on the Buffalo. By 1806 four more churches had been constituted, and the six united in forming the Mississippi Baptist Association. Population flowed in rapidly from this time onward, and the Baptist cause was greatly strengthened. Among the Baptist immigrants of the early years of the present century were Thomas Mercer and David Cooper.

By 1812 the number of churches had increased to 17 and the number of members to 764.

Louisiana Baptists are closely related to those of Mississippi. The Mississippi Baptist settlements mentioned above were contiguous to the Louisiana border, and when a number of Baptists moved into Louisiana they were visited by the ministers of Mississippi. Bailey E. Chaney removed with his family from Cole's Creek, Miss., to East Feliciana Parish, La., in 1798, and soon began to preach. He was arrested, and released on his promise to cease preaching in that jurisdiction. He seems to have returned to Mississippi. Ezra Courtney, who had removed

from South Carolina to Mississippi in 1802 and had settled near the Louisiana border, besides founding a church in Mississippi, ministered to a company of South Carolina Baptists who had settled about nine miles from Baton Rouge. He was threatened with imprisonment, but through the favor of the alcalde, whose friendship he won, he was enabled to continue his work. In neither of these localities was a church constituted until after 1813. The first church formed in Louisiana was on Bayou Chicot in 1812. It had been gathered by the labors of Joseph Willis, a mulatto, who had long been one of the leading Baptist ministers in Mississippi and had labored in close association with Richard Curtis. In 1813 the Mount Nebo and Peniel churches on the Pearl River were constituted as a result of the labors of some young evangelists from Mississippi. These churches united with the Mississippi Association soon after their formation.

In 1813 there were in Louisiana 3 churches, with a membership of 130.

CHAPTER VI.

STRUGGLES FOR CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN NEW ENGLAND.¹

THE disabilities under which Baptists labored in Massachusetts and Connecticut during this period have been sufficiently noticed in earlier chapters. The new charter of Massachusetts granted by William and Mary in 1691 provided for "liberty of conscience in the worship of God to all Christians, except Papists, inhabiting or which shall inhabit or be resident within our said province or territory." By a strange perversion this seems to have been taken to mean that the General Court might encourage and protect the religion of the majority. Until 1728 Baptists were regularly taxed for the support of the churches of the standing order. An exception was made in the case of Boston and a few other towns. On their refusal to pay such taxes they were in many cases imprisoned and their goods distrained and sacrificed. Many Baptists had conscientious scruples against so far acquiescing in an iniquitous arrangement as would be involved in voluntary payment, and preferred loss and suffering to compliance. The exemption act of 1728, renewed and modified from time to time, has already been quoted. As the exemption laws required the annual presentation before a specified date of formally prepared lists certified by particular classes of persons, and as no penalties attached to failure to carry

¹ Cf. Backus, "Hist." and "Tracts"; Hovey; Guild, "Smith" and "Manning"; Burrage; Curtis; and Armitage.

out the provisions of the law on the part of the local officials, the spirit of the law was no doubt frequently violated and Baptists deprived of the relief intended.

The Separate Baptists were more strenuous in insisting upon their rights under the charter than were those of the old order. One of the chief objects in organizing the Warren Association in 1767 was to promote concerted denominational action in the struggle for religious freedom.

The records of the Warren Association for 1769 state that "many letters from the churches mentioned grievous oppressions and persecutions from the standing order; especially the one from Ashfield, where religious tyranny had been carried to great lengths." A committee was appointed, consisting of Backus and others, to draft a petition for redress to the Massachusetts and Connecticut courts, another committee to present the petition, and a third to collect well-authenticated cases of oppression under the laws. The petitions were promptly presented, but proved ineffective. The Committee of Grievances labored with zeal to ascertain the exact truth in the cases that came to their attention.

To further their work of collecting facts, and doubtless to forewarn the authorities that a determined effort was about to be made for religious equality, an advertisement was inserted in the Boston "Evening Post" of August 30, 1770. After reminding the Baptists of the persecutions that they had suffered the document proceeds: "You are desired to collect your cases of suffering and have them well attested—such as, the taxes you have paid to build meeting-houses, to settle ministers and support them, with all the time, money, and labor you have lost in waiting on courts, feeing lawyers, etc., and bring or send such cases to the Baptist Association to be holden at Bellingham; when measures will be resolutely adopted for ob-

taining redress from another quarter than that to which repeated application hath been made unsuccessfully. Nay, complaints, however just and grievous, have been treated with indifference, and scarcely, if at all, credited. We deem this our conduct perfectly justifiable; and hope you will pay particular regard to this desire, and be exact in your accounts."

The implied determination to take the case to the throne was no idle threat. This course had been determined upon only after long-continued efforts at home had failed to secure redress. From the point of view of the Massachusetts and Connecticut authorities nothing could be more inopportune than the presentation to the English government of such a bill of grievances as was here proposed. The agitation in favor of colonial resistance to the taxes that had recently been imposed by the British government had already begun. Taxation without representation was regarded as tyranny. Baptists claimed that the taxes imposed upon them for the support of a form of religion in which they could have no part was in sheer contradiction to the principle involved in this contention. That the Baptists should threaten to appeal to a government against which their fellow-colonists were preparing to rebel was looked upon as little better than treason.

At the meeting of the Association in September following a large body of grievances was presented. In view of these it was unanimously resolved "to send to the British court for help, if it could not be obtained in America." While Baptists were as strongly opposed as any to the British measures that resulted in the Revolution, they had reluctantly come to the conclusion that as a last resort appeal to Britain would be justifiable. In pursuance of the object of the above resolution, John Davis, pastor of the Second Baptist Church, Boston, was appointed by the

Association to use his best endeavors, with the advice of the committee, to obtain a full deliverance from ministerial taxes. Backus was one of the most laborious and useful members of the committee. Soon after the associational meeting a petition was drafted by Stillman, Smith, and Davis, on behalf of the Baptist Committee of Grievances, and presented to the Massachusetts General Court. The grievances are set forth in a strong, businesslike way. A recent resolution of the Massachusetts House of Representatives "that no taxation can be equitable where such restraints are laid upon the taxed as take from him the liberty of giving his own money freely," is quoted in support of the Baptist position with reference to ecclesiastical taxes. The Ashfield case is given as one of the most notorious examples of the iniquitous working of the laws. In 1761 a Baptist church had been established in Huntstown, a frontier township in which worship had for years been maintained by Chileab Smith and his family. The church was regularly constituted, and Ebenezer Smith, a son of Chileab, became pastor. Of the nineteen families in the township only five were opposed to Smith's ordination as pastor. In the Indian war the Baptists had defended the town with great courage and success. Soon after the war the families opposed to the Baptists, having been reinforced by the incoming of others, were constituted a Congregational church, settled a minister with the privileges of the first minister of the town, voted him £100 settlement and £64 a year, arranged for the building of a meeting-house, and taxed the Baptists, including their minister, for a proportionate amount of the expense. To annul the claims of the Baptists to be the first church organized, and so entitled to exemption from taxes for the maintenance of pedobaptist worship, a new town called Ashfield was incorporated in place of Huntstown. To

quote from the petition: "In consequence of which law, and by a power granted in the same to the proprietors of Ashfield aforesaid, three hundred and ninety-eight acres of our land have been sold to build and remove and repair, when moved, a meeting-house in which we have no part, and to settle and support a minister whom we cannot hear. The lands were valued at three hundred and sixty-three pounds eighteen shillings, . . . and were sold for nineteen pounds three shillings; so that our loss is three hundred and forty-four pounds fifteen shillings. . . . Part of the lands aforesaid belonged to the Rev. Ebenezer Smith, a regularly ordained Baptist minister, who, together with his father and others, their brethren, in the last Indian war, built at their own expense a fort and were a frontier; and this they did without any help from any quarter; for which we beg leave to say that they deserve, at least, the common privileges of the subjects of the crown of England. Part of said lands had been laid out for a burying-place, and they have taken from us our dead. They have also sold a dwelling-house and orchard, and pulled up our apple-trees, and thrown down our fences, and made our fields waste places." Complaint is also made of the law "by which no Baptist can avail himself even of that law [the exemption law] in new-settled towns; and we are thereby virtually prevented from settling in such towns." In conclusion the petitioners ask the court to repeal the law erecting Ashfield into a town, to restore the lands taken from Baptists, to give them damages for the injuries they have been made to suffer, and to enable Baptists "in different parts of the Province to recover damages for the losses they have been made to sustain on religious account." They ask for "perpetual exemption to all Baptists and their congregations from all ministerial rates whatsoever."

In response to this petition a new exemption law was enacted, in which the offensive term "Anabaptist" gave place to "antipedobaptist." Certificates of being "conscientiously of the antipedobaptist persuasion" were to be "signed by three or more principal members and the minister, if any there be." The last clause was intended to meet cases of pastorless churches, whose certificates had been held to be invalid. The term "conscientiously" was strongly objected to, as it gave to the local authorities the right to sit in judgment on the consciences of professing Baptist adherents and to refuse to accept the certificates of any not actually members of Baptist churches.

The committee met to consider the revised law and unanimously voted it unsatisfactory. Some time before the promulgation of the new act the Baptist advertisement referred to above was violently attacked in the newspapers, and Davis felt called upon to publish a full exposure of the wrongs that had been committed against Baptists. He was shamelessly maligned by the press, and every effort was made to make him odious to the public. Davis was a graduate of the Philadelphia College and is highly spoken of by his contemporaries. He was a newcomer in New England and was probably driven from his post by the violence of the obloquy to which he was exposed. He died shortly after leaving Boston.

At the session of the Association in 1772 Backus was appointed agent in place of Davis. In a circular to the churches, dated May 5, 1773, he asked the churches to consider the question whether it would not be better for all the churches to refuse to comply with the law requiring certificates, those suffering special hardship for refusal to be assisted by such as enjoyed immunity. His idea was that "the root of all these difficulties, and that which has done amazing mischief in our land, is civil rulers assuming

a power to make any laws to govern ecclesiastical affairs, or to use any force to support ministers." He was of the opinion that if all Baptists should refuse compliance with the law, its enforcement would soon become so odious that it would be abandoned, and that, economically considered, it would soon prove to be the least expensive course. The matter received the prayerful consideration of the Association at its next meeting. When it came to a vote, "thirty-four elders and brethren" were "against giving any more certificates, six for it, and three at a loss how to act." It was also voted that an appeal to the public, a draft of which Backus read to the Association, should be completed, examined by the committee, and published. In publishing this appeal the committee were encouraged by "several members of both houses of our great General Court." The hopefulness of the committee at this time is thus expressed in a letter written by Backus to Dr. Stennett, of London, who, along with Dr. Llewelyn and Mr. Wallin, was confidential counselor and agent of the New England Baptists. After stating the facts given above, he proceeds: "The state of people's minds of various ranks through New England is such that I cannot but hope to obtain our freedom without a necessity of appealing to his Majesty. The use of force in religion is become odious to great numbers besides our own denomination, and that is increasing very fast" (Hovey, "Life and Times of I. Backus," pp. 190 *seq.*).

The "Appeal to the Public for Religious Liberty, against the Oppressions of the Present Day," published toward the close of 1773, sets forth in a masterly manner the Baptist position respecting the entire separation of church and state and absolute liberty of conscience, and pleads for the abolition of the grievances that are fully and clearly stated. The reasons of the Baptists for refusal to conform to the

law with reference to certificates are thus given (pp. 43 *seq.*): " 1. Because the very nature of such a practice implies an acknowledgment that the civil power has the right to set one religious sect up above another, else why need we give certificates to them any more than they to us? It is a tacit allowance that they have a right to make laws about such things, which we believe in our consciences they have not. For, 2. By the foregoing address to our legislature, and their committee's report thereon, it is evident that they claim a right to tax us from *civil obligation*, as being the representatives of the people. But how came a civil community by any ecclesiastical power? how came the kingdoms of *this world* to have a right to govern in Christ's kingdom, which *is not of this world*? 3. That constitution not only emboldens people to *judge the liberty of other men's consciences*, and has carried them so far as to tell our general assembly that they conceived it to be a *duty they owed to God* and their country, not to be dispensed with, to lay before them the springs of their neighbors' actions; but it also requires something of the same nature from us. Their laws require us annually to certify to them what our belief is concerning the *conscience* of every person that assembles with us, as the condition of their being exempted from taxes to other worship. And only because our brethren in Bellingham left that clause about the *conscience* out of their certificates last year, a number of the society who live at Mendon were lately taxed, and suffered the spoiling of their goods, to uphold pedobaptist worship. 4. The scheme we oppose evidently tends to destroy the purity and life of religion; for the inspired apostle assures us that the church is *espoused as a chaste virgin to Christ* and is obliged to be *subject to him in everything*, as a true wife is to her husband. Now the most chaste domestic obedience does not at all interfere

with any lawful subjection to civil authority; but for a woman to admit the highest ruler in a nation into her husband's place, would be *adultery* or *whoredom*, and how often are men's inventions about worship so called in the sacred oracles? . . . 5. The custom which they want us to countenance is very hurtful to civil society; for by the law of Christ *every man* is not only allowed, but also required, to judge for himself concerning the circumstantial, as well as the essentials, of religion, and to act according to the *full persuasion of his own mind*; and he contracts guilt to his soul if he does the contrary. . . . What temptation then does it lay for men to contract such guilt, when temporal advantages are annexed to one persuasion, and disadvantages laid upon another? i.e., in plain terms, how does it tend to hypocrisy and lying? than which, what can be worse to human society? Not only so, but coercive measures about religion also tend to provoke to emulation, wrath, and contention, and who can describe all the mischiefs of this nature that such measures have produced in our land?" The happy effects of freedom are illustrated by the case of Boston, and a letter of Massachusetts Congregational ministers to Governor Jenckes, of Rhode Island, a Baptist, when Congregationalists were seeking (1721) "to get footing in the town of Providence," is quoted. The letter commends the "hearty union and good affection of all pious Protestants," and expresses the hope and prayer "that ancient matters (that had acrimony unhappily in them) may be buried in oblivion." The reply of the Providence authorities is also quoted, in which recent persecutions of Baptists in Massachusetts are referred to and rebuked, and in which the happiness of the Rhode Island government is declared to consist "in their not allowing societies any superiority one over another; but each society support their own ministry of their own free will, and

not by constraint or force upon any man's person or estate. But the contrary that takes any man's estate by force to maintain their own or any other ministry, it serves for nothing but to provoke to wrath, envy, and strife, and *this wisdom cometh not from above, but is earthly, sensual, and devilish*. . . . We say, far be it from us to revenge ourselves; or to deal to you as you have dealt to us, but rather say, *Father, forgive them; they know not what they do.*"

In January, 1774, Backus addressed a letter to Samuel Adams, a foremost opponent of the British policy of taxation without representation, in which he sought to show that the policy of Massachusetts in relation to the Baptists is open to precisely the same objections, and asked for the use of his influence in favor of the repeal of all legislation that discriminated against Baptists. A number of fresh cases of oppression under the law had recently come to the notice of the committee. On January 26, 1774, Backus, as agent for the Baptist churches, addressed a Memorial and Petition to the Massachusetts government, asking for the liberation of Baptists who were lying in prison for conscience' sake, the reparation of their goods, and legislation to obviate the recurrence of such persecutions.

A law more favorable to the Baptists soon afterward passed both houses of the legislature, but in consequence of the sudden prorogation of the court it failed to receive the signature of the governor.

In September, 1774, delegates from twelve provinces assembled in Congress at Philadelphia with a view to agreeing on concerted resistance to Britain. Backus was urged by Manning, Gano, Van Horne, and Smith to proceed to Philadelphia and "to see if something might not be done to obtain and secure our religious liberties." On

September 14th he was appointed by the Warren Association to undertake this work. A number of brethren accompanied him, and he had the coöperation of the Philadelphia Association, which met October 12th and appointed a Committee of Grievances to correspond with that of the Warren Association. A meeting of Baptist representatives with leading New England statesmen and others was held on October 14th. The principal members of Congress present were Thomas Cushing, Samuel Adams, John Adams, and R. T. Paine, of Massachusetts; James Kinzie, of New Jersey; Stephen Hopkins and Samuel Ward, of Rhode Island; and Joseph Galloway and Thomas Mifflin, of Pennsylvania. The mayor of Philadelphia and several prominent Quaker gentlemen were active participants in the conference. The prominent Baptists present, besides Backus, were Manning, Gano, Samuel Jones, William Rogers, and Morgan Edwards. President Manning opened the conference and read a memorial that had been drawn up for the occasion. The memorial begins: "It has been said by a celebrated writer in politics that but two things were worth contending for,—Religion and Liberty. For the latter we are at present nobly exerting ourselves through all this extensive continent; and surely no one whose bosom feels the patriot glow in behalf of civil liberty can remain torpid to the more ennobling flame of Religious Freedom. The free exercise of private judgment, and the unalienable rights of conscience, are of too high a rank and dignity to be subjected to the decrees of councils, or the imperfect laws of fallible legislators. The merciful Father of mankind is the alone Lord of conscience." The grievances of Baptists in Massachusetts and the inadequacy of the exemption laws to afford the relief needed are set forth as in the documents above referred to. It is claimed that the charter is infringed by the refusal to Baptists of full liberty

of conscience. The memorial concludes: "Consistently with the principles of Christianity, and according to the dictates of Protestantism, we claim and expect the liberty of worshipping God according to our consciences, not being obliged to support a ministry we cannot attend, whilst we demean ourselves as faithful subjects. These we have an undoubted right to, as men, as Christians, and by charter as inhabitants of Massachusetts Bay."

The Massachusetts congressmen sought to make light of the restrictions on liberty of conscience in their province. They admitted that an establishment of religion existed, but claimed that the exemption law removed any just ground of complaint. Samuel Adams called attention to the fact that it was not the Regular Baptists but the enthusiasts of the New Light order that were making complaint. Backus gave the facts about Ashfield, and stated that he could not conscientiously give in the certificates required by law. After a four hours' session the conference closed, with a promise on the part of the Massachusetts congressmen to do what they could for the relief of the Baptists; but John Adams is said to have remarked that the Baptists might as well expect a change in the solar system as to expect that the Massachusetts authorities would give up their establishment.

The bold and uncompromising spirit in which the Baptists pressed their claims for religious liberty at Philadelphia was exceedingly irritating to the Massachusetts statesmen. They are said to have spread the report that Backus had gone to Philadelphia to prevent the colonies from uniting in resistance to Britain, and to have accused Baptists of bringing imaginary grievances to the front at a highly critical time. To correct the impression that the Baptists of New England were indifferent to the cause of civil liberty and that they were contending about trifles,

Backus addressed a letter to the Congress of Massachusetts, November 22, 1774. After reciting the grievances he proceeds: "Must we be blamed for not lying still, and thus let our countrymen trample upon our rights, and deny us that very liberty that they are ready to take up arms to defend for themselves? You profess to exempt us from taxes to your worship, and yet tax us every year. Great complaints have been made about a tax which the British Parliament laid upon paper; but you require a paper tax of us annually. That which has made the greatest noise is a tax of three pence a pound upon tea; but your law of last June laid a tax of the same sum every year upon the Baptists in each parish, as they would expect to defend themselves against a greater one. . . . All America are alarmed at the tea tax; though, if they please, they can avoid it by not buying the tea; but we have no such liberty. We must either pay the little tax, or else your people appear, even in this time of extremity, determined to lay the great one upon us. But these lines are to let you know that we are determined not to pay either of them; not only upon your principle of not being taxed where we are not represented, but also because we dare not render that homage to any earthly power which I and many of my brethren are fully convinced belongs only to God. We cannot give in the certificates you require, without implicitly allowing to men that authority which we believe in our consciences belongs only to God. . . . If any ask what we would have, we answer: Only allow us freely to enjoy the religious liberty that they do in Boston, and we ask no more."

Some members of the Congress were for ignoring this letter, but Adams was apprehensive lest such a course should cause a division among the provinces. Lack of jurisdiction in such matters was claimed, and Baptists were

politely advised to lay their grievances before the next General Assembly. In view of this failure to secure the relief contended for, the Philadelphia committee advised, as "our only resource," that application be made "on the other side of the Atlantic." "This channel," they wrote, "we ought ever to keep open, and not to preclude ourselves by our own conduct from being heard there with that attention and favor that our case will require. Our conduct ought to be such as to prevent us, on the one hand, from being deemed enemies to our country; and to secure to us, on the other, a favorable reception at the throne, if it should be necessary to apply there at a future day."

Pennsylvania and New Jersey were at this time strongly averse to revolution, and the tone of the letter from which quotation has been made was in part a result of this sentiment.

The indefatigable Backus prepared another memorial for the General Court, which met in September, 1775. It received the very careful consideration of the court. Major Hawley, a plain-spoken member, told the court that the Baptists had been ill treated, that the established religion was not worth a groat, and he wished it might fall to the ground. After some debate the memorial was referred to a committee of seven, three of whom were Baptists. Dr. Asaph Fletcher, one of the Baptist members, was authorized by the court to bring in a bill for the redress of Baptist grievances. It was proposed that the Baptists be asked to withdraw their memorial, but Major Hawley hoped it would lie on the files "till it had eaten out the present establishment." It is evident that progress was being made.

The Warren Association resolved at its meeting in 1775 that "our agent and committee be desired to draw up a letter to all the Baptist societies on this continent, stating

the true nature and importance of religious liberty, and signifying that we think that a general meeting of delegates from our societies in every colony is expedient, as soon as may be, to consult upon the best means and methods of obtaining deliverance from various encroachments which have been made upon that liberty, and to promote the general welfare of our churches, and of all God's people throughout the land." Backus had appealed, not wholly in vain, to the Philadelphia, Charleston, and other Associations in 1774 for financial aid for the oppressed in New England. This call for a meeting of the Baptists of the continent was the first effort to bring the representatives of the entire body together. The outbreak of hostilities between the colonies and the mother-country would have made the meeting impracticable, even if no other obstacles had presented themselves. Such a meeting could never be secured till the denomination had been aroused on behalf of foreign missions.

A new constitution was framed by the Massachusetts General Court in 1777, to be acted upon by the same body a year later. An article restoring some of the old ecclesiastical laws alarmed the Baptists, who circulated about a hundred copies of a petition against the perpetuation of these laws and insisting that it be "a fundamental principle of our government that ministers shall be supported only by Christ's authority, and not at all by assessment and secular force,—which impartial liberty has long been claimed and enjoyed by the city of Boston." Many besides Baptists signed this petition. As the proposed constitution was rejected the petition was not presented.

The pen of Backus was kept busy in publishing complaints and in warding off attacks. Even in the midst of the war Baptists continued to suffer oppression. Yet Stillman, of Boston, was appointed to preach the election

sermon in 1778, and he utilized the occasion for setting forth the Baptist view of the relations of church and state.

In 1779 a Constitutional Convention was held at Cambridge. The obnoxious laws were again incorporated. Again the Baptists circulated a remonstrance, which was largely signed. Nevertheless the General Court of 1780 adopted a constitution that fell considerably short of the Baptists' demand. It empowered the legislature to make "suitable provision" for the support of ministers, yet it declared that "no subordination of one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law." It was as yet unsettled whether the certificate law could still be enforced. A test case was soon brought before the courts, and decision was at last given in favor of the Baptists (1783). But trouble was not yet at an end. Members of a church organized in Cambridge in 1781 were taxed to the support of the Congregational minister, and when appeal was made to the courts decision was made against them. The only recourse was "to sue the money out of the hands of those who took it," and to do this they must give in certificates. Contrary to the advice of Backus, this course was pursued, and "their minister sued the money out of the hands of their oppressors, from time to time, until they left off collecting such money." Backus informs us that "the like was done in various parts of the country."

In 1786 a law was passed for amalgamating civil and ecclesiastical taxes. Out of the common rate a majority of the qualified voters might vote "such sums of money as they shall judge necessary, for the settlement, maintenance, and support of the ministry, schools," etc. This law, while not nominally discriminating in favor of Congregational ministers, was evidently intended to subserve their interests. It withdrew from Baptists even the poor protection they had under the old exemption law. Cases

of oppression gradually became less frequent, as public sentiment grew against such tyranny. The condition of things in 1796 is thus described by Backus: "Though the teachers and rulers of the uppermost party in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont are as earnest as ever Pharaoh was, to hold the church of Christ under the taxing power of the world, to support religious ministers, yet that power is daily consuming by the Spirit of God's mouth, and the brightness of his coming. Very few of them now dare to make distress upon any who refuse to pay ministers' taxes; and the credit of Baptist churches and ministers is daily rising, in all parts of our country. And the gospel, enforced upon the souls of men by the Spirit of God, has been the evident cause of it; for before the work of his Spirit in the county of Hampshire, under the ministry of Edwards and others, in and after 1734, there were but six Baptist churches in all the governments of Massachusetts and Connecticut, and none in New Hampshire; Vermont was not then begun. Yet in these four States there are now two hundred and eighty-five Baptist churches, and they are increasing fast, against all the powers of the world. . . . Not less than twenty-eight such churches have been formed in the counties of Cumberland, Lincoln, and Hancock, in the District of Maine; besides a number more which are not in fellowship with those churches."

Yet religious liberty was not established in Massachusetts by the complete separation of church and state until 1833, a strenuous effort to secure this end having failed as late as 1820.

Little has been said about the struggle in Connecticut. An exemption law in favor of Baptists and Quakers, with the requirement of certificates, had been enacted there in 1729. During and after the Great Awakening,

when large numbers of Separate churches were being formed and many of these were becoming Baptist, restrictions were put upon the use of the privileges of exemption. It is probable that Baptists in Connecticut suffered greater hardship than those in Massachusetts. The revised statutes of 1784 were more favorable to Baptists than the Massachusetts arrangement of 1780. The removal of all obstructions to religious freedom in Connecticut occurred in 1820.

CHAPTER VII.

THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE IN VIRGINIA.¹

IN the preceding sketch of the remarkable growth of the Baptist cause in Virginia from about 1755 to the beginning of the Revolution little was said of the persecutions to which Baptists were subjected. As a result of the British Act of Toleration of 1689, the Virginia authorities had tardily and reluctantly abandoned the policy of excluding and exterminating dissent. Under the Act of Toleration dissenting ministers were allowed to carry on their work provided they would take out licenses for particular places. The General and the Regular Baptists, by conforming to this regulation, suffered little persecution. The Separates were too full of enthusiasm to limit their activities to particular places. They traveled widely, preaching the gospel wherever they could find hearers. Their meetings were sometimes disorderly from excess of enthusiasm, and furnished at least a pretext for civil interference. Their violent denunciations of the worthless and corrupt clergy aroused the hostility of this privileged class. Some of the most prominent of the Separate Baptist ministers were repeatedly imprisoned and otherwise maltreated. Their meetings were often broken up by mobs and the leaders threatened—sometimes assaulted. Thrilling stories could

¹ Cf. Semple; Taylor; Curry; Curtis; Howell; Armitage; Henning, "Statutes at Large"; Hawks, "Contr. to Eccl. Hist."; Foote, "Sk. of Va."; Works of Jefferson and Madison.

be told of the heroism and enthusiastic devotion of these men, of the way in which their persecutors were changed into zealous adherents and fellow-laborers, of their preaching from prison-windows to crowds of earnest listeners, and of their uncompromising refusal to comply with requirements which they thought to be against the will of God.

The chief cause of the rapid growth of dissent in Virginia was undoubtedly popular disgust with the irreligious, tax-fed, and exacting clergy. Owing their appointments to British influence, they were nearly all extreme opponents of colonial rights. Most of them were connected with the English aristocracy, and they found their associates chiefly among the sporting aristocracy of Virginia, in whose amusements and vices they freely joined. No doubt there were many exceptions, but the general correctness of the above statements is fully attested by Episcopal writers of undoubted integrity. The aversion of the people to the clergy had been intensified shortly before the war by the following circumstance: The clerical stipends had been fixed by law in pounds of tobacco. Owing to deficient crops in 1755 and 1758 the price of tobacco had risen, and as many debts had been contracted in terms of tobacco serious hardship was involved. As a measure of relief, the Virginia Assembly made all debts payable at the rate of twopence to the pound of tobacco. The clergy resisted this commutation, induced the British government to declare the act invalid, and attempted to compel their parishioners to pay the difference between twopence a pound and the market price of tobacco. Patrick Henry, the noted Presbyterian lawyer and statesman, resisted the enforcement of the decision of the king in council, and in a test case before a Virginia court the jury fixed the damages at one penny. Nothing could have been more unpopular than this effort of the clergy,

for their own profit and at the expense of the people, to thwart the will of the people by invoking British interference. In this procedure they signed the death-warrant of their special privileges. The action of the king in council in declaring the law passed by the Assembly void was one of the most irritating of all the measures that led to the Revolution.

From this time onward Baptists and Presbyterians co-operated heartily for the overthrow of the established religion.

The years immediately preceding the Revolution were marked by wonderful spiritual prosperity and bitter persecution. At a meeting of the General Association in 1774 it was "agreed to set apart the second and third Saturdays in June, as public fast-days, in behalf of our poor blind persecutors, and for the releasement of our brethren." At the meeting of the Association in 1775, stimulated, no doubt, by the example of their brethren in New England and by the counsel of those of the Philadelphia Association, it was resolved to circulate petitions, to be presented to the General Assembly, for the abolition of the church establishment and the protection of all religious societies in the peaceable enjoyment of their own religious principles and modes of worship. Jeremiah Walker, John Williams, and George Roberts were appointed to wait on the legislature with these petitions. It was further decided to petition the Assembly for the privilege of preaching in the army. The latter petition was readily granted.

At the next meeting of the General Association, in 1776, a committee was appointed to "inquire whether any grievances existed in the civil laws, that were oppressive to the Baptists." The Committee reported that the marriage law was "partial and oppressive." Marriages could be legally effected only by the offices of the Episcopal clergy. It

was agreed to memorialize the next General Assembly, "praying for a law affording equal privileges to all ordained ministers of every denomination."

At the October meeting of the General Assembly, in response to the petitions of Baptists and others, laws were passed suspending the payment of the stipends of the clergy and "exempting the different societies of dissenters from contributing to the support and maintenance of the church, as by law established, and its ministers." Thomas Jefferson, who from the beginning of the struggle was the staunch advocate of liberty of conscience, was the leading spirit in the Assembly and had much to do with this legislation. The suspension of the payment of clerical salaries was repeated in 1777, and in 1779 all legislation concerning the payment of such salaries was repealed. From 1776 onward the question of a general assessment for the support of ministers of religion was much agitated. The proposal was that all alike be assessed, but that each individual have the right to designate the church or minister to whom his rate should be paid.

In 1778 the General Association appointed a committee of seven to report on grievances. They reported that should a general assessment take place it would be injurious to the dissenters in general; and that the assumption of the clergy of the former established church that they have exclusive right to officiate in marriages has subjected dissenters to great inconveniences. They recommended that two be appointed to lay these grievances before the next General Assembly. Jeremiah Walker and Elijah Craig were appointed for this purpose.

In 1779 Walker was able to make a highly gratifying report, and a resolution was passed approving of the bill establishing religious freedom. In view of the prospect of an early amendment of the marriage law many Baptist

ministers took the responsibility of celebrating marriages, acting on the advice of Patrick Henry, who considered this the most efficacious means of securing the legislation desired. At the request of the Association these marriages were sanctioned by a special act of the Assembly.

By 1780 the less aggressive Regular Baptists had been awakened to the need of making their influence felt in favor of reform, and they appointed a committee to act in conjunction with a committee of the General Association.

Reference has already been made to the division of the General Association into District Associations and the constitution of the General Committee in 1783. This committee, composed of four delegates from each District Association, had for its chief aim the consideration of "all the political grievances of the whole Baptist Society in Virginia, and all references from the District Associations which concern the Baptist Society at large." Its plan of action provided, further, that "no petition, memorial, or remonstrance shall be presented to the General Assembly from any Association in connection with the General Committee; all things of that kind shall originate with the General Committee." The marriage law, the vestry law, and the proposal for general assessment were the matters that first received the attention of the Committee. At its first meeting, in 1784, it was decided to ask the General Assembly to repeal the laws referred to. Reuben Ford, who had been appointed to wait on the Assembly, reported at the meeting in 1785 that he had fulfilled his commission and that "certain amendments had been made to the marriage law which he thought satisfactory." The law in force for some time restricted the licenses of dissenting ministers to four of each denomination in each county, and allowed these four to exercise these licenses only in the county in which they resided. These restric-

tions were removed at this time. He reported that "a bill for a general assessment was introduced and had almost passed into a law," but that a motion had prevailed "that it should be referred to the next General Assembly in order to give the people an opportunity to consider it." One of the hardest struggles the Baptists ever had for religious liberty was that through which they defeated this bill. The Presbyterians, who in most matters stood shoulder to shoulder with the Baptists, were far from being united and zealous in opposition to this measure so radically opposed to Baptist principles. The resolution of the General Committee on this matter is so admirable a presentation of the Baptist position that it must be quoted in full: "Resolved, That it be recommended to those counties which have not yet prepared petitions to be presented to the General Assembly against the engrossed bill for a general assessment for the support of the teachers of the Christian religion, to proceed thereon as soon as possible; that it is believed to be repugnant to the spirit of the gospel for the Legislature thus to proceed in matters of religion; that no human laws ought to be established for this purpose, but that every person ought to be left entirely free in respect to matters of religion; that the holy Author of our religion needs no such compulsive measures for the promotion of his cause; that the gospel wants not the feeble arm of man for its support; that it has made, and will again, through divine power, make, its way against all opposition; and that should the Legislature assume the right of taxing the people for the support of the gospel, it will be destructive to religious liberty."

Reuben Ford was appointed to wait on the General Assembly with remonstrance and petition. In their struggle against general assessment Baptists had the influential support of such statesmen as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison,

and George Mason, who were among the foremost advocates of liberty of conscience. General assessment was defeated in the Assembly in 1786, and an act was passed, drawn up by Jefferson, lucidly expounding the doctrine of religious liberty.

The next politico-religious matter that engaged the attention of the General Committee was the law for the incorporation of the Episcopal society. It was resolved at the meeting in 1786 "that petitions ought to be drawn and circulated in the different counties and presented to the next General Assembly, praying for a repeal of the incorporating act, and that the public property which is by that act vested in the Protestant Episcopal Church be sold and the money applied to public use, and that Reuben Ford and John Leland attend the next Assembly as agents in behalf of the General Committee." Representatives of the Regular Baptist Association (the Ketokton) were, at this meeting, received as full members of the Committee. John Leland from this time onward was one of the leaders of the denomination in the struggle for liberty of conscience and in evangelization. Born in Massachusetts in 1754, he removed to Virginia in 1775, where he labored for about fifteen years and baptized seven hundred believers. His later years were spent in New England. He was one of the very ablest men of his time, and, though somewhat eccentric and not always working harmoniously with his brethren, his influence was wholesome and profound. His "Virginia Chronicle" is one of the chief sources of information on the period that it covers.

Ford and Leland waited upon the General Assembly and secured the repeal of the incorporation act complained of by the General Committee. But the glebe-lands that had been set apart for the benefit of the Episcopal clergy were still left in their hands. A majority of the General

Committee decided (1787) that these lands ought to be viewed as public property. But as some were of a contrary mind no action was taken at this meeting. The union of Regulars and Separates was consummated at this time and the denomination greatly strengthened for aggressive work thereby.

In 1788 the General Committee extended its view so as to embrace national questions. The United States Constitution had been drafted, and its ratification by the various States was in progress. The question was raised in the committee, whether the new Federal Constitution made sufficient provision for the secure enjoyment of religious liberty. It was the unanimous opinion of the Committee that it did not. A noble letter was drafted by John Leland, signed by the officers of the Committee, and sent to President Washington. After a full historical statement with reference to the recent struggles for civil liberty, and complimentary references to Washington's part therein, it proceeds: "The want of efficiency in the confederation, the redundancy of laws, and their partial administration in the States, called aloud for a new arrangement of our systems. The wisdom of the States for that purpose was collected in a grand convention, over which you, sir, had the honor to preside. A national government in all its parts was recommended as the only preservative of the Union, which plan of government is now in actual operation. When the Constitution first made its appearance in Virginia, we, as a society, feared that the liberty of conscience, dearer to us than property or life, was not sufficiently secured. Perhaps our jealousies were heightened by the usage we received in Virginia, under the regal government, when mobs, fines, bonds, and prisons were our frequent repast. Convinced, on the one hand, that without an effective national government the States would

fall into disunion and all the subsequent evils; and, on the other hand, fearing that we should be accessory to some religious oppression, should any one society in the Union predominate over the rest; yet, amidst all these inquietudes of mind, our consolation arose from this consideration—the plan must be good, for it has the signature of a tried, trusty friend, and if religious liberty is rather insecure in the Constitution, ‘the administration will certainly prevent all oppression, for a WASHINGTON will preside.’ . . . Should the horrid evils that have been so pestiferous in Asia and Europe, faction, ambition, war, perfidy, fraud, and persecution for conscience’ sake, ever approach the borders of our happy nation, may the name and administration of our beloved President, like the radiant source of day, scatter all these dark clouds from the American hemisphere.”

The essential part of the President’s reply may also be quoted: “If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed by the Convention where I had the honor to preside might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the general government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny and every species of religious persecution. For, you doubtless remember, I have often expressed my sentiments that any man, conducting himself as a good citizen and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience. While I recollect with satisfaction that the religious society of which you are members have been, throughout America, uniformly and

almost unanimously the firm friends to civil liberty, and the persevering promoters of our glorious Revolution, I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be the faithful supporters of a free yet efficient general government. Under this pleasing expectation, I rejoice to assure them that they may rely upon my best wishes and endeavors to advance their prosperity."

That these were no empty assurances the sequel will show. A short time afterward James Madison, with the approval of the President, submitted certain amendments. According to Article VI. of the original Constitution, Congress was prohibited from imposing religious tests in connection with "any office or public trust under the United States." This left Congress at liberty to impose religious tests for other purposes than those specified. In place of this the following was adopted as Article I.: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for the redress of grievances." The importance of this provision, which resulted from what might have seemed the extreme sensitiveness of the Virginia Baptist General Committee, is now almost universally recognized. This amendment was strenuously opposed by a number of representatives in Congress, especially by those of Massachusetts and Connecticut; but it was adopted by a considerable majority September 23, 1789. It was ratified by all the States except Massachusetts and Connecticut before the close of 1791.

The only dragons that still remained in the path of the General Committee were the glebe-lands still held by the Episcopal clergy, and the institution of slavery. Petition after petition was made for the confiscation of these lands.

Success crowned their efforts in 1799. They uttered the strong protest against slavery already noticed, but this proved ineffective. Having accomplished work of the noblest and most momentous kind, the Committee disbanded in 1799, giving place to the General Meeting of Correspondence, which held its first session in 1800.

Little importance is to be attached to the tradition that Jefferson derived his idea of civil government afterward incorporated in the United States Constitution from observation of the polity of a Baptist church. There were Baptist churches near his home, and there is no doubt but that he was in friendly intercourse with the wise and eloquent John Leland. As a student of political science Jefferson must have been perfectly familiar with the real and ideal republics of the past, and he did not need to go to a Baptist church for ideas of democratic government. It is possible, however, that certain features of government may have been impressed upon his mind as suitable for his own land and time through his intercourse with Baptists.

PERIOD III.

FROM THE ORGANIZATION OF THE TRIENNIAL
CONVENTION TO THE PRESENT TIME (1814-1894).

CHAPTER I.

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT.

THE final period of American Baptist history begins with the conversion of Judson and Rice to Baptist views and the inauguration of the modern missionary movement. As the effects of these conversions on the denomination did not assume tangible form until 1814, the beginning of the period may be dated in that year.

By 1812, through processes that have been indicated in the preceding chapters, the denomination had increased to a membership of 172,972, grouped in 2164 churches and shepherded by 1605 ministers. Baptists were well distributed throughout the seventeen settled States and had begun to take root in a number of the more sparsely settled Territories. Virginia led the Baptist hosts with 35,665; Kentucky, a newly occupied but rapidly settled State, followed with 22,694; New York came third with 18,499; Georgia occupied the fourth position with 14,761; North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee follow with 12,567, 11,821, and 11,325, respectively; the New England States altogether had 32,272 Baptists and the Middle States 26,155.

It will be borne in mind that the numerical strength had been more than doubled in the preceding ten years, as according to careful estimates it did not much exceed eighty thousand at the beginning of the century. The revivals of the first decade of the century had prepared the way

for the great onward movement to be described in the chapters that follow.

The mass of the Baptists were indifferent or hostile to ministerial education, and circumstances were such that a high standard of literary and theological preparation for the ministry would in any case have been unattainable. The Baptists of the Philadelphia Association had long since taken the lead in all that pertained to the elevation of the character and dignity of the denomination, and their influence had been profoundly felt in New England and the South. The Charleston and Warren Associations were formed by men who had been trained in the Philadelphia, and perpetuated and extended the beneficent influences of the older body. Brown University was, as has been seen, the direct product of the planning of the Philadelphia Association, and its success was due to the efforts of men who had their spiritual birth and training in this wise and conservative, yet progressive, organization. Under the influence of the New Light movement the spread of the denomination was too rapid to allow of any sort of educational standard for the ministry. Those who were converted under the highly emotional preaching of the Separate Baptist evangelists shared so fully in the enthusiasm of these preachers that they could wait for no preparation. The success of such men in soul-winning, as compared with the failure of educated but unspiritual ministers, had a tendency to produce in themselves and in those among whom they labored the conviction that learning was not only unnecessary but harmful, as leading men to trust in human resources rather than in the power of the Holy Spirit. It is needless to say that under such circumstances emotional excitement was often mistaken by ministers and people for spiritual quickening.

Brown University was still, at the beginning of the

present period, the only degree-conferring institution under Baptist control. The Baptists of the Charleston Association had established an Education Fund in 1791, and before 1810 had expended \$3397 in assisting young men in preparing for the ministry; but the nineteen young men aided before 1813 had either pursued their studies privately under the direction of pastors or had been sent to colleges already established. The elder Dr. W. T. Brantly was assisted at South Carolina College, and some before and after this date were sent to Brown University. In the same year (1791) the Warren Association established a charitable fund "for the purpose of assisting such young men of the Baptist denomination as may appear to be suitably qualified for the ministry, with a collegiate education." A "Board of Trustees of the Baptist Education Fund" was afterward constituted. The Baptists of Georgia had made an earnest effort during the first decade of the century to found a college; but the time for success was not yet. The question of denominational education had for many years been agitated among Virginia Baptists, but those who were really interested in the matter were so few that nothing could be accomplished until long after the beginning of the present period. Opposition was more pronounced to ministerial than to literary education under denominational auspices. The enlightened and enterprising men who labored for the establishment of a Baptist college in Georgia felt it necessary, as has been seen, to guard against the supposition that the proposed college was "designed for the education of our children with a view to the ministry." Many who favored denominational literary education would have looked upon a modern theological seminary as a human effort to accomplish that which is God's sole prerogative. In 1812 the Baptist Education Society of the Middle

States was formed, and under its auspices Dr. William Staughton, of Philadelphia, began to instruct students for the ministry.

Hand in hand with the widespread opposition to ministerial education went a strong prejudice against ministerial salaries. If without spending time and means in securing an education, and without special study in the preparation of sermons, men are qualified by the Holy Ghost to preach the gospel, why should they not support themselves by pursuing the ordinary secular occupations? As a matter of fact most of those who felt called to enter the ministry possessed farms and (especially in the South) slaves to cultivate them. Many men thus situated and having a fair education to begin with devoted a large amount of time to private study and became good literary and theological scholars; but a large proportion undoubtedly fell very far short of attaining to such a grasp of truth as would have made them instructive preachers. Noisy declamation in unnatural tones, accompanied by violent physical exercises and manifest emotional excitement, in too many cases took the place of intelligent exposition of the truth made vital by the indwelling power of the Spirit. The latter part of the preceding period and the beginning of the present produced a large number of Baptist preachers of the highest grade; but the average of ministerial culture was low, and the large amount of illiteracy in the ministry, and the widespread satisfaction with an illiterate ministry, furnished an obstacle of the most serious nature to the onward and upward movement that has characterized the recent history of the denomination.

The facts just referred to enable us to account for the general neglect of the cities and towns. Town people were less susceptible to the evangelistic methods employed, and were less willing to listen to the earnest but uncouth

exhortations of illiterate preachers. Most of those who entered the ministry then, as now, were country-bred, and preferred to live on their farms and preach within reach of their homes rather than attempt to plant churches in the towns and cities. As there were no home mission societies to encourage the occupation of important centers, it was difficult to find men properly qualified for town work that could gain a support while doing foundation work. Many of the ablest ministers, some of whom could have afforded to live in cities and devote themselves to the upbuilding of city churches, preferred the independence of rural life and work, and declined calls to city pastorates. These remarks apply more particularly to the South and least of all to New England, where from the beginning town life was emphasized. Scores of cases might be cited in which the ablest preachers persistently declined city pastorates, even when good salaries were offered. The case of Andrew Broaddus, of Virginia, whose ministry extended from 1791 to 1848, has many parallels. He preferred to minister to country churches, though sought for by leading churches in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, and Richmond. At one time he was prevailed upon to accept the pastorate of the First Church, Richmond, but he soon resigned in favor of his beloved country churches in Caroline County. The case of Richard Furman, who left the High Hills of Santee to accept the Charleston pastorate, and who gained in the chief city of South Carolina an almost unparalleled influence, is exceptional; and the strong and highly intelligent church that he built up shows what might have been accomplished in other cities if the very best men had been willing to devote their lives to city work. It was with the utmost difficulty that churches like those of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia could supply vacancies when they oc-

curred. These remarks apply to the latter part of the preceding period and the early part of the present.

Little had been attempted in the way of periodical literature before the beginning of the present period. Henry Holcombe's "*Analytical Repository*" (1801-02) failed to receive the support necessary for its continuance. The next venture of the kind was the "*Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine*," the first number of which was published in September, 1803. The twelfth number, completing the first volume, was not reached until January, 1808. Dr. Thomas Baldwin, pastor of the Second Church, Boston, and one of the most eminent Baptist ministers of the time, edited it for the first fourteen years. Its publication has been continuous to the present time. In 1826 it became the organ of the Triennial Convention and omitted the State name from its title. At first it was a religious miscellany. The work of English Baptist missionaries was kept constantly before its readers, and home mission matters were duly emphasized.

From the very beginning there was much of domestic missionary work accomplished by Baptists. Nothing was more characteristic of the Separate Baptists than the missionary spirit that impelled them to carry the gospel into the most remote and destitute regions. The Philadelphia Association was from its organization largely interested in church extension and evangelization, and its beneficent work has been duly recorded. The Charleston Association entered upon home mission work early in its history and did not remit its fruitful efforts for supplying destitute regions with gospel privileges. In fact, every Association gave some attention to home evangelization.

As early as 1800 some Baptist and Congregational women of Boston united in forming the Boston Female Society for Missionary Purposes, and Cent Societies

were soon afterward organized in many Baptist churches throughout the country. In 1802 the Massachusetts Domestic Missionary Society was formed, the object being "to furnish occasional preaching and to promote the knowledge of evangelic truth in the new settlements in these United States; or further, if circumstances should render it proper." The work of this society soon extended to Maine, Canada, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Missouri. Joseph Cornell, who was sent to New York State and Canada, reported that he had traveled six hundred miles without meeting a minister of the gospel. The society early determined to "know neither East nor West, North nor South," but to extend gospel privileges in every direction as far as means would allow.

The Lake Baptist Missionary Society was formed at Pompey, Onondaga County, N. Y., in 1807, and in 1809 became the Hamilton Missionary Society. The aim of this society was domestic evangelization. An auxiliary female society was soon afterward organized, and in 1812 presented the general society with "twenty yards of fulled cloth," accompanied by an address full of the missionary spirit.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Baptists of America were first brought to recognize their obligation to aid in propagating the gospel in foreign parts by the conversion of Judson and Rice. From the beginning of the English Baptist missionary movement under Carey, American Baptists manifested the deepest interest in the work. Carey was early in correspondence with representative American Baptists, such as Drs. Rogers and Staughton of Philadelphia, Mr. Williams of New York, Drs. Stillman and Baldwin of Boston, Dr. Furman of Charleston, etc. In 1805 Benjamin Wickes, of Philadelphia, a pious Presbyterian sea-captain who had taken out several of the

missionaries and had become profoundly interested in their work, visited the Baptist mission in India. On his return through England he secured one thousand guineas from the Baptist Missionary Society for publishing versions of the Scriptures by Carey and Marshman, and undertook to raise an additional sum in America. Ministers of various denominations in Philadelphia united in signing an appeal for funds for this purpose and in commending Captain Wickes as trustworthy. A number of ministers of various denominations in different localities throughout the country were designated as agents for receiving and transmitting funds. Under the influence of this appeal by the Philadelphia ministers the ministers of various denominations in Boston took the matter up with great heartiness and put forth (April, 1806) an equally enthusiastic appeal on behalf of the Bible translation fund. These documents (published in the "Massachusetts Missionary Magazine," June, 1806) show how profoundly impressed the leaders of the various evangelical denominations were with the importance of the work that was being done by Carey and his coadjutors, and how cordial had become the relations between Baptists and other evangelical bodies in the great centers. A large proportion of the money raised at this time was due to the efforts of Drs. Furman and Keith, of Charleston. From this time till the inauguration of American Baptist foreign missionary work considerable sums were collected from year to year and forwarded to the missionaries at Serampore. In 1812 the Baptist churches of Philadelphia began holding a monthly concert of prayer "for the spread of the ever-blessed gospel." Besides these monthly union meetings, "quarterly prayer-meetings for the spread of the gospel" were held by members of each church, usually in the homes of those specially interested. In May, 1813,

a special missionary sermon was preached and a collection taken "for the purpose of assisting the mission at Serampore toward reimbursing the loss by the late conflagration."

The period on which we are entering has been one of unexampled material development. Immigration on a large scale had already set in, and the process of occupying the vast regions in the interior had made good progress. It was to go forward with accelerated speed. In 1813 cities were few and small, and the great preponderance of influence, especially in the South, was in the rural districts. Cities have grown in a far greater ratio than the population and have become the great centers of influence. As already suggested, outside of a few of the older and more important cities the great mass of the Baptist population was gathered in country churches, many of them well organized and vigorous and enjoying the services of the ablest men the denomination could produce. In 1813 few of the ablest men could be induced to accept a city pastorate; in 1894 few gifted men are content to labor permanently in the country, and city pastorates are coveted as conditions of the highest ministerial influence.

The growth of the Baptist denomination has more than kept pace with the phenomenal growth of population and material resources. This growth is manifest alike in numbers, in culture, in influence upon the general religious life of the nation, in home and foreign evangelization, in educational institutions and their work, and in the quality and quantity of literary product.

CHAPTER II.

THE TRIENNIAL CONVENTION (1814-45).¹

THE missionary spirit had been increasing so rapidly within the last few years of the preceding period that, apart from the event that sent a wave of enthusiasm from Maine to Georgia, energetic measures for the fulfillment of the great commission could not long have been deferred. The denomination had gained important moral victories in the recent past and stood forth prominently as one of the great aggressive religious forces of the land. It had been greatly prospered within the first decade of the century and had doubled its membership in a few years. It was becoming conscious as never before of the greatness of its opportunities and responsibilities. American Baptists had been deeply impressed by the work of Carey and his associates and had given liberally of their means for the furtherance of this work. The missionary zeal of a group of Andover and Williams College students had resulted in the organization of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (1810) and the sending

¹ On this and the following chapter, cf. "Bapt. Miss. Mag."; "Bapt. Memorial"; "Bapt. H. Miss. in N. A., 1832-1882"; "Reports" of the Triennial Convention, the Home and For. Miss. Societies, Publication Soc., Am. and For. Bib. Soc., and Bib. Union; Bitting, "Bib. Soc. and the Bapt."; "Bapt. and the Nat. Centenary"; "Hist. Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc."; Benedict, "Fifty Years among the Bapt."; biographies of Judson, Mercer, Baldwin, Rice, Peck, Wayland, Colgate, Cone, Fuller, Poindexter, Stow, etc.; Cathcart; Campbell; Holcombe, "Ala. Bapt."; "Hist. of the Bapt. Den. in Ga."; Duncan; Paxton; "First Cent. of the First Bapt. Ch. of Richmond, Va."; and "Two Cent. First Bapt. Ch. of S. C."

forth of Judson, Newell, Hall, Nott, and Rice (February, 1812). Many American Baptists had no doubt been led thereby to inquire whether God had not a work for them to do in heathen lands.

During the voyage to India, Judson and his wife were led, through a study of the Scriptures, to change their views with reference to the subjects and the mode of baptism, and on their arrival in India were baptized by Ward, September 6, 1812. Rice, who had taken passage by another vessel, when he learned of the trying yet blessed experience of his fellow-missionaries, began at once to examine the grounds on which infant baptism was commonly justified, and came to the conclusion that it was not only without Scriptural warrant, but that it also involved a perversion of an ordinance of Christ. He was accordingly baptized by Ward on November 1, 1812. It may be readily surmised that they did not take this important step without duly considering the grave responsibility involved. They had been chiefly instrumental in awakening an interest in foreign missions among the Congregationalists of America and in bringing about the organization of what was to become one of the greatest of missionary societies. The dismay and the indignation of those that had been led by them to enlist in this work and to send them out, with the discouragement of many friends of missions, they doubtless expected. Yet loyalty to Christ required them to face the reproach of being regarded as disloyal to their brethren.

On August 31st Judson addressed a letter to Dr. Thomas Baldwin, of Boston, acknowledging the help he had received from writings of his, and inclosing a copy of his application to Dr. Carey for baptism. In the latter the following statement occurs: "My inquiries commenced during my passage from America, and, after much labori-

ous research and painful trial, . . . have issued in entire conviction that *the immersion of a professing believer is the only Christian baptism*. In these exercises I have not been alone. Mrs. Judson has been engaged in a similar examination, and has come to the same conclusion." In a letter to the secretary of the American Board he makes a manly and straightforward but thoroughly conciliatory statement of his change of conviction and his withdrawal from the service of the Board. He speaks of the dissolution of his connection with the Board of Commissioners and separation from his dear missionary brethren as "the most distressing events that have ever befallen me." "Whether the Baptist churches in America will compassionate my situation, I know not." In a second letter to Dr. Baldwin (September 1st) he wrote: "Should there be formed a Baptist society for the support of a mission in these parts, I shall be ready to consider myself their missionary." In a letter of the same date to Dr. Bolles, pastor of the Salem Baptist church, he shows that he had thought of the duty of Baptists in the foreign field before his embarkation: "I recollect that, during a short interview I had with you in Salem, I suggested the formation of a society among the Baptists in America for the support of foreign missions, in imitation of the exertions of your English brethren. Little did I then expect to be personally concerned in such an attempt." After narrating his experiences and the necessity that existed for his severing his connection with the Board of Commissioners, he proceeds: "Under these circumstances I look to you. Alone in this foreign heathen land, I make my appeal to those whom, with their permission, I will call *my Baptist brethren* in the United States."

Luther Rice, who was thought, as Carey relates, "to be the most obstinate friend of pedobaptism of any of

the missionaries," soon followed Mr. and Mrs. Judson in submitting to baptism at the hands of Mr. Ward.

The difficulties encountered by Judson in securing entrance to a suitable field of labor, and the way in which he was led to Burmah, where his great life-work was to be accomplished, cannot here be narrated. Rice resolved to return to America in order to make proper arrangements with the Board of Commissioners and to enlist the sympathies of the Baptists in Judson's proposed mission. It was his intention to return to the foreign work as soon as he should have secured a basis of support.

The news of the conversion of the Judsons reached America in January, 1813. Drs. Baldwin and Bolles lost no time in informing the denomination of what had occurred and inaugurating organized effort for the support of the missionaries. A meeting of leading Baptists of Boston and vicinity at the house of Dr. Baldwin resulted in the formation of "The Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel in India and other Foreign Parts." Dr. Baldwin was chosen president and Daniel Sharp secretary. This society undertook to raise money for the support of the Judsons, but thought it would be advisable for a time to act as an auxiliary of the English society. The English society, however, advised independent work. Not wishing to assume the responsibility of organizing a general society, and contemplating the probability of the organization of similar societies in other parts of the country, the following provision was inserted in the constitution of the Boston society: "Should societies be formed in other places, having the same objects in view, the board would appoint one or more persons to unite with delegates from such other societies in forming a General Committee, in order more effectually to accomplish the important objects contemplated by this institution."

Other societies followed, especially after the arrival (in the summer of 1813) of Luther Rice, who was requested by the New England brethren to visit the Eastern, Middle, and Southern States for the purpose of forming local societies and preparing the way for united effort. One of the most vigorous and influential of these societies was that formed by the Savannah Association (comprising churches in Georgia and South Carolina) in November, 1813. Dr. W. B. Johnson was its president and Dr. W. T. Brantly its corresponding secretary. This body addressed a remarkable circular "to the inhabitants of Georgia, and the adjacent parts of South Carolina." After a most eloquent statement of the obligation of Christians to engage in efforts for the evangelization of the world, and of the providential circumstances that called for immediate action, the document proceeds: "Since the secession of our dear brethren, Rice, Judson and lady, . . . several missionary societies have been formed by the Baptists in America. These societies have for their object the establishment and support of foreign missions; and it is contemplated that delegates from them all will convene in some central situation in the United States, for the purpose of organizing an efficient and practicable plan, on which the energies of the whole Baptist denomination, throughout America, may be elicited, combined, and directed, in one sacred effort for sending the word of life to idolatrous lands. What a sublime spectacle will the convention present! A numerous body of the Lord's people, embracing in their connection from 100,000 to 200,000 souls, all rising in obedience to their Lord, and meeting, by delegation, in one august assembly, solemnly to engage in one sacred effort for effectuating the great command: 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature'! What spectacle can more solemnly interest the benevolent

heart? What can be more acceptable to our heavenly Father? . . . God has put great honor upon us in giving us so favorable an opportunity of coming up 'to the help of the Lord against the mighty.' In doing so he has conferred on us a distinguished privilege. Shall we be insensible of the honor? Shall we disregard the privilege? God forbid! Living in a country whose generous soil yields, with moderate industry, more than a sufficiency of the comforts of life, and professing, in great numbers, to be redeemed from our iniquities, our obligations to exert ourselves for the benefit of our race and the glory of God are great indeed. . . . And we trust, in our attempt to act in this manner, no sectarian views, no individual prejudices, no party considerations, will have leave to operate any unfriendly influence upon a design conceived in disinterested benevolence, and having for its object the good of man and the honor of his Creator."

On May 18, 1814, thirty-three delegates, representing eleven States, met in Philadelphia with a view to effecting a general organization for foreign mission work. Richard Furman, of South Carolina, probably the most eminent and influential Baptist minister in America at the time, was appointed president, and Dr. Thomas Baldwin, of Massachusetts, secretary. The society organized took the name "General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions." It was arranged that it should meet triennially (hence the designation Triennial Convention). According to its constitution it was to be composed of delegates from societies contributing not less than \$100 a year to the funds of the Convention. A Board of Commissioners (twenty-one in number) was constituted for the "executive part of the missionary concern." Dr. Baldwin was chosen first president of the board and Dr. William

Staughton, of Philadelphia, corresponding secretary. It was arranged that Philadelphia should be the headquarters of the board. In 1822, with the opening of Columbian College under the auspices of the Convention, the seat of the board was transferred to Washington, where it remained till the severance of the direct relation between the college and the board in 1826, when it was removed to Boston.

The Judsons, who by this time had begun work in Burmah, were accepted as missionaries, and Rice was appointed agent of the Convention to visit the churches on behalf of the foreign mission cause.

The bringing of the denomination together in so noble a cause constitutes one of the great events in the history of the Baptists. Such a union had been for years an object of endeavor on the part of a few of the foreseeing leaders of the denomination; but to bring about a realization of such aspirations required the enthusiasm awakened by the accession of Judson and Rice to the Baptist ranks and the providential opening up of Baptist foreign mission work.

Rice proved a most effective agent. Possessed of a robust constitution, he was able to endure an incredible amount of rough travel, and his eloquence and enthusiasm won the hearts of multitudes to the cause he had espoused. Through his zealous efforts, seconded by those of the noble ministers who had heartily embraced the cause, the contributions, which in 1814 amounted to \$1239.29, reached \$12,236.84 for the year 1816. Multitudes of auxiliary societies were organized, and many of the Associations made foreign missions one of their leading objects. The early stages of the missionary movement synchronized with the war with Great Britain, into which Baptists entered with enthusiasm. They seem to have contemplated the possibility of the loss of the civil and religious freedom

that had been gained by the Revolution as a result of British triumph, and their zeal for American rights was unbounded. By 1817 the war was a matter of history, and thanksgiving was the order of the day.

The second meeting of the Triennial Convention was held in Philadelphia in 1817, and was in many respects one of the most important. Foreign missions had found many friends, but an amount of opposition had manifested itself in some quarters that augured ill for the unity of the denomination. Rice had become convinced, as a result of his four years of travel among the churches, that the great enemy of foreign missions and of denominational progress was ignorance, and that a condition of large success in foreign missions was an educated ministry. Men must be educated for the foreign field, and educated pastors must teach the people God's truth and enlighten their minds as to their responsibility for the evangelization of the world. It seemed to him and to many others that the most effective way to promote the foreign mission cause would be to found a great national Baptist educational institution. The Convention of 1814 had recognized the importance of ministerial education. The Triennial Convention of 1817 took the matter up in an effective manner. Foremost in pressing the claims of ministerial education on the attention of the Convention was the venerated Furman. The following article was at this time incorporated in the constitution: "That when competent and distinct funds shall have been received for the purpose, the board from these, without resorting at all to the mission funds, shall proceed to institute a classical and theological seminary, for the purpose of aiding young men who, in the judgment of the churches of which they are members, and of the board, possess gifts and graces suited to the gospel ministry."

A committee appointed by the Convention reported to the board in May, 1818, that "no adequate reason can be assigned for further delay. The public are entitled to expect some vigorous attempt on the part of the board. The Convention has left this business to their sacred charge. Numerous youth are waiting to avail themselves of the privileges of a literary and theological institution, and the widening sphere of missionary effort already undertaken renders an accession of godly and educated youth highly desirable." Dr. William Staughton and Rev. Irah Chase were invited to take charge of an institution that had as yet no resources beyond the good-will of the denomination as expressed through the Convention. After educating a number of men who proved able and useful, this institution was merged in Columbian College at its opening in 1822. It graduated its first classes in 1821. Funds for the assistance of students and the maintenance of the institution were collected chiefly by Luther Rice, who advocated the cause of education with all the enthusiasm of his nature, along with that of foreign missions.

Before the Convention of 1817 it had also become evident to leading minds that the permanence and success of foreign mission work required that attention be given in an organized way to home evangelization, and that the latter was as necessary as the former to the fulfillment of the great commission. As early as 1815 Luther Rice had said: "Not only do I conceive it proper that a mission should be established in the West, on account of the importance of the region in itself, but indispensably necessary to satisfy the wishes and expectations of pious people in all parts of the United States." Rice had in mind particularly the Missouri Territory, and he urged the board to take speedy action. The matter was de-

ferred, however, until the meeting of the Convention in 1817, when the constitution was so altered as to leave it at the discretion of the board "to appropriate a portion of their funds to domestic missionary purposes, in such parts of this country where the seed of the word may be advantageously cast, and which mission societies, on a small scale, do not effectively reach." Under this authorization John M. Peck and James E. Welch, both of whom had studied under Dr. Staughton, were solemnly designated to mission work in the West. In sending forth these evangelists the board expressed the conviction that "western as well as eastern regions are given to the Son of God as an inheritance, and that his gospel will triumph amid the settlers of the Mississippi and the sublimer Missouri, and extend to the red inhabitants of the wilderness." Welch, after laboring successfully in the West for three years, returned to the East and became agent for the American Sunday-school Union. In 1848 he removed to Missouri, where he labored for many years in planting and building up churches. Peck might well be called the apostle of the West. He gave his entire life from the time of his appointment to the planting and fostering of Baptist principles in Missouri, Illinois, and adjacent territories. After 1820 he was for some time in the employ of the Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Society. At Rock Island, Ill., he established (1827) a seminary of general and theological instruction, which at one time had a hundred students and which was afterward amalgamated with the institution at Upper Alton, afterward to become Shurtleff College. As a means of forwarding his educational and missionary work, and of counteracting the errors of Daniel Parker and of Alexander Campbell, he published (1829 onward) a periodical, under various names. No man in his time was so well acquainted with the territory in which

he labored, and he made contributions of the utmost value to the denominational and general history of this region.

Thus a national educational and a national home mission movement had by 1817 grown out of the efforts to establish on a firm basis the national foreign mission enterprise. During the next triennial period Rice labored with consuming zeal for the establishment of a national Baptist university at the nation's capital. He fully appreciated the vast advantages that would accrue to the denomination from the establishment of an institution of high grade in the city of Washington, and the economy that would be involved in utilizing the educational appliances that were already available and were sure to increase in importance and value at the center of national government. For a time the idea of a great national Baptist university gained such a hold upon the denominational sympathies as almost to dispute the first place with the foreign mission cause. State enterprises, that had previously occupied denominational attention, were for some time kept in abeyance. Education societies were organized in many localities, and considerable money had been raised for this purpose before the Triennial Convention of 1820. An eligible site was purchased in Washington, and buildings were projected that "were intended to range with the cardinal points of the compass, and to exhibit the best possible view from every direction, combining economy, utility, convenience, and magnificence."

Most of the responsibility in planning and contracting for the buildings and equipment, and in arranging for the support of the faculty, was allowed to rest upon Rice, who still bore the responsibility of raising funds for missions. Full of enthusiasm, and ever sanguine even in the face of discouragements, he went far beyond the funds available for the purpose and involved the institution in debt. At

a meeting of the board in April, 1821, it was decided to open the college for students in theology in September, 1821, and for students in arts in January, 1822. The outlines of a curriculum were drafted on this occasion, and a theological faculty was nominated, consisting of William Staughton, president, and Irah Chase and Alva Woods, professors. It was further resolved to nominate two professors for the classical department. Several eminent men in Washington, otherwise employed, agreed to give courses of lectures gratuitously, and a salaried professor and a tutor were added before the opening in January, 1822. Baptists had the sympathy and support of such leading statesmen as John Quincy Adams and James Monroe in this enterprise, and the former especially gave large practical aid. Internally the college prospered. A large number of able students entered its classes. But by 1826 it had become inextricably involved in debt. So desperate had become the financial situation that mission funds were seriously drawn upon to meet necessary payments. As Rice had been foremost in collecting, handling, and designating funds, he was obliged to bear the brunt of the blame that fell upon the board when the finances came to be investigated. It was commonly agreed that Rice was among the most unselfish of men, but was lacking in business capacity and had allowed himself to plan expenditures on a scale far beyond what prudence would have dictated. The accounts of receipts and expenditures were very loosely kept, and it was not easy to determine precisely what funds had been given for missions and education respectively. Some were so uncharitable as to suspect Rice and others of a dishonest use of funds; but he showed his disinterested devotion to the cause by giving into the funds of the college not only the money he had been able to save during twelve years of arduous serv-

ice at a salary of \$400 a year, but also a patrimony of \$2000 or \$3000. Removed from the responsible agency, he continued till his death, in 1836, to labor assiduously, without remuneration, for the institution that he loved with rare devotion, and when dying requested that his horse and buggy, his only possessions, be sent to the agent of the college.

The funds of the Convention were further drawn upon by the journalistic enterprises of the agent. The value of religious journalism was fully appreciated by this enterprising man. He hoped that the "*Columbian Star*" (a weekly begun in 1822) and the "*Latter Day Luminary*" (first a quarterly and afterward a monthly, 1816 onward) would more than pay their way through their subscription lists and the additional interest they would create in the objects of the Convention. In this, as in many of his other projects, he was too sanguine.

Before the crisis referred to had been reached it had been decided to abandon the theological department of the college and to turn this work over to the Massachusetts Baptist Education Society, that hoped, with the coöperation of the other New England States, to make suitable provision for its maintenance. A charter was secured in 1825, and Newton Theological Institution opened its doors for students in 1826. Irah Chase was transferred from *Columbian College* as president, and Henry J. Ripley was appointed as his colleague.

So profound was the dissatisfaction of the denomination with the diversion of missionary funds to educational purposes that it was thought advisable in 1826 to dissociate the college as completely as possible from the Convention, the right of nominating fifty persons from whom the board should be chosen being the only connection retained.

The demands of the work undertaken among the Indians

of America were found to be far greater than the Convention had counted on, and the demands of the foreign work were rapidly increasing. It was determined in 1826 to concentrate attention more and more upon foreign work, and, apart from maintaining the Indian mission stations in Michigan, New York, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Georgia, opened some time before, to leave domestic evangelization to other agencies. The chief cause of the withdrawal of the Convention from domestic mission work was the widespread dissatisfaction on the part of pioneer Baptist ministers and their churches in the West, that was soon to develop into pronounced anti-missionary sentiment.

It will not be practicable to give in any detail the history of the work on the foreign field. The labors and the sufferings of the Judsons, the encouraging and the discouraging features of their work during the first two decades, are familiar to all students of foreign missions. Judson won for himself a place among the greatest missionaries of the ages, and for the cause of Christ some of the greatest triumphs of modern times. The mission was reinforced from time to time by new appointments of noble men and women, and at times seemed likely to be utterly extinguished and the missionaries destroyed by the hostility of the despotic government. But faith and perseverance triumphed, not without sufferings, however, that resulted in premature deaths that may well be called martyrdoms. Up to 1828 there was little to show for the toils and sufferings of the heroic missionaries and of the friends of missions at home; but the martyr sufferings of Ava and Oung-pen-la had stirred the hearts of American Baptists and prepared the way for a great enlargement of the work. Foundation work of the utmost importance in the mastery of the language and in Bible translation had been accomplished, and enough converts had been won to demonstrate the fact

that even in Burmah the gospel is the power of God unto salvation.

About 1815 the colored Baptists of Richmond became fired with missionary enthusiasm, organized the Richmond Baptist African Missionary Society, and began at once to raise funds for a mission in Africa. Lott Carey and Collin Teague were sent out with funds thus raised under the direction of the general board, and began work in 1822 at Monrovia in Liberia, where a number of American freedmen were attempting to establish a colony. Carey was a man of marked ability and high character, and his labors were greatly blessed. The triumphs and discouragements of this mission cannot be here detailed.

The expenditures of the board during the year ending April, 1827, were \$15,408.32. The Indian (American) schools were largely supported by government grants.

Among the important results of the stimulus given to denominational life by the foreign mission movement, through the Triennial Convention and the agencies it employed, was the formation of State Conventions. Massachusetts had State denominational organization as early as 1802. Under the impulse of the missionary movement South Carolina followed in 1821. The controlling influence in the formation of the Convention was that of Richard Furman. In December, 1821, delegates from the Charleston, Edgèfield, and Savannah River Associations met at Columbia for the purpose of effecting a State organization. It was designed to be "a bond of union, a center of intelligence, and a means of vigorous, united exertion in the cause of God, for the promotion of truth and righteousness; that so those energies, intellectual, moral, and pecuniary, which God has bestowed upon the denomination in this State, might be concentrated, and brought into vigorous, useful operation." "The grand

objects" of the Convention are stated in the constitution to be "the promotion of evangelical and useful knowledge, by means of religious education; the support of missionary service among the destitute; and the cultivation of measures promotive of the true interest of the churches of Christ in general, and of their union, love, and harmony in particular." "The organization and support of a seminary of learning in this State, for the gratuitous education of indigent, pious young men for the gospel ministry, on a plan in accordance with the interests of that established by the denomination at large [Columbian College], . . . shall be considered by this body as an object of primary importance." The Convention promised "to use their vigorous efforts to engage the most able, pious, and suitable ministers of the denomination in the prosecution of missionary service." The encouragement of Sunday-schools and the religious instruction of children in families are other specified objects of the Convention.

The fact that only three of the seven Associations participated in the organization of the Convention is an indication of the opposition to the advance movement that was already becoming aggressive in this as well as in other States.

The example of South Carolina was speedily followed by Georgia, and in a few years most of the older States had their Conventions, with objects similar to those of the South Carolina. In nearly all the States the most bitter opposition was encountered, and in some the opposition was so strong as to cause the postponement of State organization for a number of years. Particulars with reference to the anti-mission movement must be deferred to a later chapter. In Georgia vigorous efforts had been made during the first decade of the century for general organization in the interest of education and missions. Not-

withstanding earnest efforts to secure the coöperation of all the Georgia Associations in the formation of the General Association (called the Convention from 1827) only two sent delegates to Powelton in June, 1822. The Georgia Association was represented by Jesse Mercer, W. T. Brantly, W. Hilman, James Armstrong, and J. P. Marshall; the Ocmulgee by Cyrus White. A number of other brethren were present as individuals and took part in the deliberations, among them Adiel Sherwood, afterward to become one of the most eminent leaders of the denomination. This was a small representation for the inauguration of so important an enterprise; but men like Mercer and Brantly felt that a beginning must be made. A constitution was adopted in which "the specific objects" are stated to be: "1. To unite the influence and pious intelligence of Georgia Baptists, and thereby to facilitate their union and coöperation. 2. To form and encourage plans for the revival of experimental and practical religion in the State and elsewhere. 3. To promote uniformity of sentiment and discipline. 4. To aid in giving effect to the useful plans of the Association. 5. To afford an opportunity to those who may conscientiously think it their duty to form a fund for the education of pious young men who may be called by the Spirit and their churches to the Christian ministry. 6. To correspond with bodies of other religious denominations on topics of general interest to the Redeemer's kingdom, and to promote pious and useful education in the Baptist denomination."

An eloquent statement, penned, no doubt, by the zealous and accomplished Brantly, was sent forth to the denomination throughout the State, explaining the objects of the General Association, vindicating it from the objections that were likely to be raised against it, and pleading for active coöperation. In the face of an appalling amount

of unreasonable opposition the State organization gradually won its way and became highly influential.

In New England little of the anti-missionary spirit manifested itself and State organizations were formed with comparative ease. The dates of organization were: Connecticut, 1823; Maine, 1824; Vermont, 1825; New Hampshire, 1826. Various general missionary and other societies were at work in New York before 1821, when the State Missionary Convention was organized. In 1825, through the union of this body with the Hamilton Missionary Society, the State Convention, on its present basis, was formed. Virginia had long enjoyed united denominational action. The General Meeting of Correspondence, which had taken the place of the General Committee in 1800, gave place to the Baptist General Association of Virginia in 1823. Here, also, powerful and determined opposition was encountered. Out of the twenty Associations in the State, with a membership of about forty thousand, only fifteen delegates, representing a few of the Associations, were present at the meeting for organization. Pennsylvania secured State organization in 1827, and New Jersey in 1830. In North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri the opposition was so powerful as to baffle the efforts of the friends of missions and education to effect State organization. The Conventions, when formed, represented a small fraction of the denomination, but by faith and perseverance they have been able to draw to themselves the strength of the body. After repeated failures, organization was effected in North Carolina in 1830, in Tennessee in 1832, in Missouri in 1834, in Kentucky in 1832 and (after the dissolution of the first organization) permanently in 1837.

The agitation by Luther Rice and others on behalf of a national Baptist university stimulated the desire that had

long before found expression in several of the States for Baptist institutions of learning. This strong desire for local institutions, together with the discouragement that resulted from the unwise and almost disastrous financial management of Columbian College, caused such a withdrawal of interest from the latter as seriously to threaten its existence. It was doubtless a mistake to attempt to found a national university in advance of the establishment of State denominational institutions.

The earliest of these new State denominational institutions to appear was that in Maine. In 1813 a charter had been secured, and in 1818 Jeremiah Chaplin began giving instruction in theology and other branches to a small number of students at Waterville. In 1820 this school, opened under denominational patronage, assumed college functions. Instruction was given in theology as well as in arts until the opening of Newton Theological Institution in 1826. In consideration of a large donation by Gardner Colby, of Massachusetts, the name of Waterville College was changed to Colby University. A member of the first graduating class in 1820 was George Dana Boardman, the famous missionary to the Karens.

The early interest in education among the Baptists of the Charleston Association has already been referred to. After the organization of the Convention in 1821 earnest attention was given to the establishment of a seminary of learning. The address to the denomination by the newly organized Convention, prepared by Richard Furman, emphasized the importance of ministerial education and defended it against the objections that existed in the minds of a large proportion of South Carolina Baptists. The matter was discussed even more fully in the address of the next year (1822), written by Dr. W. B. Johnson. It was a cherished desire of the South Carolina Baptist leaders

that a college should be founded in common by the Baptists of their own State and those of Georgia, and negotiations with the Georgia Convention, that seemed for a while likely to result in favorable action, were conducted (1824-26); but State feeling proved an insuperable obstacle. Valuable work had been done for a number of years in ministerial education by Dr. John M. Roberts, pastor of the High Hills of Santee church. He gave gratuitous instruction to beneficiaries of the Education Fund of the Charleston Association, and to others, both before and after the organization of the Convention. In 1826 the Furman Academy and Theological Institution was established by the Convention, at Edgefield, with J. A. Warne as principal. The General Committee of the Charleston Association coöperated heartily with the Convention and transferred to the institution at Edgefield the library that had been collected for the use of students for the ministry. The new enterprise proved a comparative failure. After two years the principal resigned, the classical department was abandoned, and the work of theological instruction was intrusted to J. Hartwell, at the High Hills. The Convention of 1829 appointed Hartwell principal of the Furman Theological Institution, and in 1830 associated with him Samuel Furman, a son of the Charleston pastor. A building was erected, a large number of students gathered, and success seemed assured. But difficulties arose, and in 1834 the professors resigned and the work was suspended. The next experiment was made in Fairfield district (1835), and combined manual labor with theological and classical instruction. W. E. Bailey, who had been professor in Charleston College, accepted the principalship, buildings were again erected, and success again seemed assured. Conflagration (1837) blasted the budding hopes of the denomination. The principal resigned in 1838 and

work was suspended in 1840. Theological instruction was resumed in 1838 under Dr. Hooper, who had resigned a chair in the University of North Carolina. J. S. Maginnis, afterward prominently connected with educational work at Hamilton and at Rochester, was soon afterward called to his assistance. Both of these resigned before the close of 1839, the former accepting a position in the South Carolina College. They were succeeded by J. L. Reynolds and Jeremiah Chaplin, Jr. The latter resigned after a short period of service and became well known in New England as pastor and author. The former was to be for many years prominently connected with the educational work of South Carolina. The institution did not develop into Furman University until 1851.

New York State had been settled very rapidly since the beginning of the Revolutionary War. Baptist churches had multiplied through immigration from New England and through great revivals. By 1817 there were in the State about 28,000 Baptist church-members, 310 churches, and only 230 ministers of all shades of efficiency and inefficiency. West of the Hudson there were only three Baptist ministers that had enjoyed the advantages of a collegiate training, and the great mass of the ministers were illiterate. Daniel Hascall, of Hamilton, began early to plan for the removal of this great obstacle to denominational progress. In 1816 he received a visit from Nathaniel Kendrick, then of Vermont, and discussed with him the question of providing educational facilities for the growing denomination. Kendrick settled in the neighborhood the next year, and afterward became one of the chief factors in the solution of the problem. In May, 1817, just as the importance of denominational education was being impressed upon the Triennial Convention by Furman and others, five or six brethren met at the house of Deacon

Samuel Payne, in Hamilton, to converse, pray, and plan for the beginning of educational work. The result was that a call was issued for a meeting to be held in Hamilton in the following September. Thirteen leading brethren met and organized the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York. During the first year one student, Jonathan Wade, was assisted to the extent of \$27.12½. During the next year Eugenio Kincaid, afterward to become a devoted missionary, was added. These brethren enjoyed private instruction only.

Earnest but not very successful efforts were made to raise funds for the opening of a college. A charter was secured at the session of the legislature for 1818-19, and it was decided to open a school in Hamilton on the promise that \$6000 should be raised in the vicinity. The board was ready to open a school in 1820. Vain efforts were made to secure great men from a distance for the principalship, and they had to be content with the services of Daniel Hascall, the moving spirit in the enterprise. He was assisted by Zenas Morse; and Nathaniel Kendrick, while retaining his pastorate at Eaton, gave courses of lectures. In 1822 a regular class in divinity was organized, with Kendrick for instructor. During these early years Baptists in Vermont and Connecticut coöperated to a considerable extent in the maintenance and patronage of the institution. An education society formed by the Baptists of New York City and vicinity in 1817 began to coöperate with the Hamilton society in 1822. The institution gained steadily in popular favor, buildings were erected, and in 1828 the faculty was enlarged by the appointment of S. S. Whitman and Barnas Sears, the latter to become a denominational leader. In 1831 A. C. Kendrick, still among us in venerable age and universally beloved and honored, became a tutor in the institution.

Further additions to the faculty and extensions of the course were made in 1833 and in 1834, and the institution took its place among the best literary and theological schools in the country, a position which it has well sustained. Not until 1839 were the doors of the institution thrown open to students of good moral character not having the ministry in view. The idea of ministerial education long continued to dominate the policy of the institution.

Under the impulse of the new awakening of the life of the denomination through the united effort of the denomination in foreign mission work, the aspirations of leading Georgia Baptists after local educational facilities, thwarted in the earlier time, were to have a noble fulfillment. Through the influence of Jesse Mercer, himself one of the largest contributors, about \$20,000 were given by Georgia Baptists toward the establishment of Columbian College before the inauguration of the final efforts that resulted in the founding of Mercer University. In 1827 a recommendation of the executive committee of the General Association (Convention) was adopted "that each member of this body, and several ministering brethren within our bounds, be requested to use their exertions to advance this object [the raising of a fund for theological education] by removing prejudices and showing the value of education to a pious ministry. There are in this State more than 20,000 members. Is there one of these who would be *deprived of the privilege* of giving fifty cents for so desirable an object?" The ignorance and prejudice encountered by Mercer, Sherwood, Sanders, Kirkpatrick, and other noble apostles of enlightenment might well have discouraged men of less faith and fortitude.

Dr. A. Sherwood, a native of New York, a graduate of Union College, and an undergraduate of Andover Theological Seminary, performed services of the utmost value

in awakening interest in education. As pastor of the Eatonton church and principal of the Eatonton Academy he trained a number of students for the ministry, giving them private instruction in theology. Among his pupils were Jesse H. Campbell, the noted historian of the Georgia Baptists, and J. R. Hand, a useful minister. The "Christian Index," in the hands of Jesse Mercer, was an important enlightening agency. It set forth in no measured terms the unreasonableness and irreligion of opposition to missions and education, and multiplied the friends of progress. The opponents of education laid stress on the argument from inspiration. If God inspired his servants in the olden time, why not now? They claimed that men called of God were qualified by the Holy Spirit, apart from any human agency, and that they received directly from God the message he would have them deliver. Mercer, in the "Christian Index" (1834), thus answers this argument: "The argument drawn from the gifts and promises of God to inspired men in favor of the advantages of ministers now is, in our judgment, a very deceptive one, because the analogy is not true. Will any man pretend that ministers are now inspired, so that their sermons may, with equal propriety, be styled inspired sermons? If so, then the Scriptures are not the only rule of faith and practice, but these sermons have equal claim."

At the Convention of 1829 it was announced that Josiah Penfield had left a legacy of \$2500 as a fund for education, on the condition that a like sum be raised. The amount was subscribed on the spot. The names of the donors and the amounts subscribed have been preserved. Mercer led off with \$250, Cullen Battle followed with \$200, and many whose names are still fragrant among Georgia Baptists contributed each according to his means. In 1832, additional funds having been raised for the purpose, a tract of land

was purchased in Green County and a manual-labor school was opened, with B. M. Sanders, a college graduate, a minister, and a practical farmer, as its head. The school was styled Mercer Institute, in honor of the great advocate and promoter of education; and the village which grew up on the lands purchased was named Penfield, in honor of him whose legacy made the institution a possibility. But such a school could not long satisfy the educational aspirations of the denomination. Stimulated by the successful efforts of the Presbyterians to found a college, Mercer suggested that efforts be made to secure funds for the founding of a university at Washington, Ga., his home. The suggestion "took like wild-fire," to use his own language. Agents were put in the field in 1837 and were soon able to report \$100,000 subscribed for "The Southern Baptist College," as the institution was somewhat ambitiously named in the charter that had been secured. A financial crisis soon afterward greatly impaired the subscription list and led to a surrender of the charter. But the interest aroused had been too great to allow of much delay. In the same year a new charter was secured for Mercer University, and a transfer of many of the subscriptions to the more ambitious enterprise was made for the development of the institute at Penfield into a college. A faculty, with Sanders as president and Sherwood as theological professor, was appointed in 1838 and classes were organized early in 1839. Among the tutors appointed at this time was S. P. Sanford, who, after teaching for more than fifty years and winning the hearts of multitudes of students, is spending an honored old age as emeritus professor. The board was able to report \$50,000 of interest-bearing funds and a somewhat larger amount in good subscriptions. Mercer gave largely toward this amount and bequeathed to the institution enough to bring his gifts to

about \$40,000. Thus the institution started upon its noble career well endowed, according to the standards of the time.

The Georgia Convention was by no means indifferent to the religious instruction of the colored people. In 1835 it was resolved "that we recommend to all our brethren a due consideration of the best method of affording religious instruction to the black population among us; and that such facilities be afforded for this instruction as in their best judgment may be deemed most expedient." Further steps were taken in the same direction in 1839.

In 1832 the seminary that had been founded at Rock Spring, Ill., by John M. Peck was removed to Upper Alton, then looked upon as a town of great promise. Seven friends of education became responsible for \$1675 as a founding fund for "a college to be under the supervision of Baptists." These seven, together with James Lemen and J. M. Peck, constituted the first board of trustees. Land was purchased, and with the aid of further donations from the citizens buildings were erected. A college charter was secured in 1835. The school opened with an attendance of twenty-five, under the direction of Hubbell Loomis and Lewis Colby. In consideration of a gift of \$10,000 from Benjamin Shurtleff the college adopted his name. Adiel Sherwood, who had contributed so much toward the success of the educational movement in Georgia, was president from 1841 to 1846. A theological department was added at a later date, and both departments have been vigorously maintained.

Soon after its organization the North Carolina State Convention inaugurated practical measures for supplying the denomination with educational facilities. In 1832 the Convention purchased a large farm in Wake County and in 1834 opened a manual-labor school styled the Wake

Forest Institute. Samuel Wait was the first principal and John Armstrong was his chief colleague. Before the close of the first year seventy students had been enrolled, and the next year powerful revivals blessed the school and endeared it to the denomination. In 1839 a college charter was procured, not without considerable difficulty. By 1861 the college had an invested endowment of \$85,000 and bonds worth \$30,000. Most of this was swept away by the Civil War.

The Baptists of Virginia were slow to attempt educational work. The matter was often discussed during the later years of the last century and the early years of the present, and committees were sometimes appointed to plan and report; but denominational apathy was too great for anything more practical. Virginia shared largely in the educational enthusiasm aroused by Luther Rice and others, and took a deep interest in the founding and sustaining of Columbian College. The fact that this institution was so near at hand and was thought by many of the leaders of the denomination to furnish ample facilities for the Baptists of Virginia was the chief reason for the long delay in founding a college in the State.

By 1830 many had come to feel that something more was needed for supplying the churches with an educated ministry. Only a small proportion of those who felt themselves called to the ministry could or would gain the preparation necessary to enable them to avail themselves of the literary advantages offered by Columbian College, and its theological work had been abandoned. A home institution in which young men and men of maturer years could be encouraged to begin and carry forward their preparation for the ministry was urgently needed. In 1830 the Virginia Baptist Education Society was organized by a number of brethren who had been called together "for devising

and proposing some plan for the improvement of young men who, in the judgment of their churches, are called to the work of the ministry." John Kerr was appointed chairman and James B. Taylor secretary. The committee appointed "to draw up a plan and report" consisted of W. F. Broaddus, J. B. Jeter, H. Keeling, and J. B. Taylor. These were all highly honored brethren, and several of them attained to national eminence. The report recommends the formation of a society for assisting young men, but not the immediate establishment of a seminary of learning. The interest of the denomination in Columbian College and the obligation to aid in sustaining it are recognized. The plan proposed is the more primitive one of placing beneficiaries "in the families of experienced ministering brethren, whose education, libraries, and opportunities to give useful instruction may enable them to render essential service to their younger brethren." It was thought that the arrangement could be made largely self-supporting by having the students labor in the adjacent country. But so primitive an arrangement as this would not long satisfy Virginia Baptists, now becoming conscious of their strength and aware of the value of an educated ministry, especially as their brethren in neighboring States were enjoying the advantages of institutions of their own.

Two years later Virginia Baptists must needs make the oft-repeated and never permanently successful experiment of a manual-labor school. A farm was purchased in the neighborhood of Richmond, and Robert Ryland, a graduate of Columbian, was appointed principal. Ryland was opposed to the founding of any school at the time and still more to the manual-labor experiment; but the wishes of his brethren overcame his reluctance and he entered with energy upon the undertaking. Ryland knew far more about Latin, Greek, mathematics, and theology than about

agriculture. He killed a field of corn by depositing a handful of salt at the roots of each stalk; yet he made \$300 for the institution by selling ice. He found a strong tendency among the students toward phonetic spelling, and it was with the greatest difficulty that he could bring them to adopt the current orthography. The salaries of the teachers depended on the amount collected from a few "pay students," as the denomination responded meagerly to appeals for help. "What we lacked in pay we made up in work," wrote the venerable Ryland long afterward. "Without any concert or design, we fell into the long-established custom of the world—that, as the duties of an office become heavy, its emoluments are light, and *vice versa*." In 1834 the farm was sold and a beautiful property in the suburbs of Richmond purchased for \$12,000. The manual-labor feature was still retained, but the accommodations and equipment were greatly improved and the school grew in popular favor. A college charter was secured in 1840, but full college work was not attempted till about five years later. The first class was graduated in 1849. By the beginning of the Civil War the college was well equipped with buildings and other appliances, and had a faculty of six professors and one tutor and an endowment of \$100,000. The college was almost wrecked by the war, but soon recovered itself and is now one of the best institutions of the kind in the South.

The Baptists of Ohio entered early upon educational work. A manual-labor school was established in 1832 near Granville, under the name "Granville Literary and Theological Institution." John Pratt was the first principal. He was succeeded in 1837 by Jonathan Going, famous as one of the founders of the Home Mission Society. In 1845 the institution assumed the dignity of a college. Granville College became Denison University in

1856 in honor of a benefactor. The career of the university has been in every way a highly useful and honorable one.

An education society was organized by Indiana Baptists in 1835, and in 1836 a manual-labor school was opened in the neighborhood of Franklin under A. T. Tilton, who was succeeded by W. J. Robinson. In 1844 the institution became Franklin College, and G. C. Chandler, a man of remarkable energy and perseverance, was its first president. With inadequate equipment and endowment the institution has gone steadily forward and has done admirable work in Christian education.

Baptists in Kentucky early realized the importance of denominational education. A charter was secured for Georgetown College in 1829, and Dr. W. Staughton, who had some time before resigned the presidency of Columbian College, was elected to the head of the new institution. His death occurred before he could enter upon his work. The college became a bone of contention between the Baptists and the Disciples, who about this time seceded in large numbers from the Baptist churches of Kentucky. Under the presidency of Rockwood Giddings (1838-40) peaceable possession of the institution and a subscribed endowment of about \$80,000 were secured. Under Howard Malcom (1840-50) the college took rank among the leading institutions of its kind. The Western Baptist Theological Institute, located at Covington, Ky., was chartered in 1840. A considerable endowment was raised, buildings were erected, an able faculty, including E. G. Robinson, was secured, and valuable work was accomplished. The board was composed partly of Northern and partly of Southern Baptists. The institute was wrecked by the agitation of the slavery question. In 1853 the property was divided between the Northern and

Southern factions. The former attempted to establish the Fairmount Theological Seminary in the suburbs of Cincinnati, the latter applied its proportion of the funds (about \$48,000) to the support of a theological department in Georgetown College.

It is not intended in the present chapter to make mention of institutions that were founded later than 1845. The educational idea, once thoroughly energetic, was sure to embody itself wherever a favorable opportunity should occur; and as the State unit in denominational affairs has had a controlling influence, each State was likely sooner or later to have one or more seminaries of learning. There are exceptions which can easily be explained, but the rule has been, "every State its own Baptist college."

CHAPTER III.

THE TRIENNIAL CONVENTION, *Continued.*

THE home mission idea that had pressed itself with such emphasis on the General Convention as to lead to a change in its constitution and in the designation of its board in 1817, but the realization of which subsequent events led the Convention to leave to other agencies, was sure to reassert itself at an early date. The spiritual destitution of the great West, with its rapidly increasing population and its magnificent prospects, could not long fail to compel united action on the part of a great and growing denomination. Judson himself, the pioneer American foreign missionary, urged upon American Baptists the importance of evangelizing the aborigines, and the spirit of foreign missions could hardly fail to emphasize the necessity of well-directed and persistent effort on behalf of this long-neglected class.

In 1831 Dr. Jonathan Going, of Worcester, Mass., returned from an extended prospecting tour full of enthusiasm for Western missions. Under his influence the Massachusetts Missionary Society adopted a resolution (November, 1831) declaring that the Baptists of the United States ought to form a general society for mission work in America, especially in the Mississippi Valley. The conviction was also expressed that Dr. Going ought to relinquish his pastoral charge and devote himself to arousing interest in this work. A committee composed of Drs. D.

Sharp and L. Bolles, both leading advocates of the foreign mission cause, was appointed to visit New York and confer with members of the New York Baptist Missionary Convention and others with reference to the formation of a general home mission society. Philadelphia was also visited in this interest. The proposal met with favor. These conferences resulted in the appointment of a Provisional Committee, with Dr. A. Maclay, of New York, as chairman, Dr. Going as corresponding secretary, William Colgate as treasurer, and Dr. William R. Williams as recording secretary. A meeting was called for the formal organization of the society, to be held in New York on April 27, 1832. The time and place were those that had been fixed upon for the Triennial Convention and insured a large attendance. The constitution that had been prepared was adopted with slight changes, the Hon. Heman Lincoln, of Massachusetts, was appointed president, a large number of the most influential ministers and laymen, representing all parts of the country, were made vice-presidents and directors, and the officers of the Provisional Committee were reappointed.

The American Baptist Home Mission Society thus entered upon its career with the fullest and heartiest support of the denomination at large and with every promise of the highest usefulness. The society was peculiarly fortunate in having for its first secretary one of the most remarkable men of his time. Jonathan Going is characterized by one of his contemporaries as "a vast, walking, magnetic machine, at every step giving off sparks through every pore of his skin, through every hair of his head, through every muscle of his face." "As for his eyes and tongue," he continues, "I can never describe them. . . . To come occasionally under the shadow of a man like Jonathan Going is worth more than to sit whole ages under the formal in-

struction of other men. Such contact would draw more electricity, impart a higher inspiration, give a more mighty and enduring impulse." His executive ability was spoken of in the highest terms, and he had long been noted for his skill in settling church difficulties. A graduate of Brown (1809), his scholarship was far in advance of that of most of the denominational leaders of the time. He had been among the foremost promoters of theological education and had had much to do with the establishment of Newton Theological Institution. "More education in the ministry was eternally his theme." He had been among the earliest and most zealous advocates of Sunday-schools. Foreign missions also had thoroughly enlisted his sympathies and his endeavors. In a word, he was the very incarnation of the progressive spirit of the denomination. The importance to the denomination of having such a leader at such a time was inestimable. He had found the Baptists in the West seriously divided in doctrine. "Gillites, Fullerites, Parkerites, Campbellites, and Stonites" were at variance with one another and greatly hindering the advance of the denomination and the evangelization of destitute regions. He was convinced that "a mighty effort must be made, . . . and made soon, or ignorance and heresy and infidelity will intrench themselves too strongly to be repulsed. And in that case it is morally certain that our republic will be overturned and our institutions, civil and religious, will be demolished." "As Baptists," he insisted, "we have a deep interest in the work of Western reform; as friends of our common Christianity we are bound to propagate it among the destitute; while as Baptists we should be solicitous that the ordinances of the gospel, in their primitive form and beauty, should be established at an early period in the important valley of the West; and it is known that the larger pro-

portion of the people are destitute of the means of salvation, while probably a thousand Baptist churches are without preaching every Sabbath." For five years he labored with remarkable zeal and success in enlisting the coöperation of State missionary societies, Conventions, Associations, churches, and benevolent individuals, and in securing educated, consecrated, and efficient ministers for the West.

During the first year 50 missionaries were employed for longer or shorter periods—6 in New York, 12 in Ohio, 5 in Indiana, 3 in Michigan, 9 in Illinois, 7 in Missouri, 2 in New Jersey, and 1 each in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Lower Canada. In the second year 80 missionaries were engaged and Upper Canada and Louisiana were added to the fields. The third year shows an increase of missionaries to 96. By 1836 the annual receipts of the society had risen to \$16,910.85.

The officers of the society were from the beginning fully alive to the importance of establishing vigorous churches in growing towns. Many of the city churches that have become centers of beneficent influence owe their origin or their rapid growth to the activity of the society. Among the mission fields of the first five years were St. Louis, Chicago, New Orleans, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Louisville, Columbus, O., Nashville, and Milwaukee. In Upper Canada, Brantford and Toronto, now important Baptist centers, received the attention of the society.

Interesting accounts of the self-sacrificing and abundant labors of the missionaries might be given. It is doubtful whether any agency employed by the Baptists of the United States has been so extensively beneficent as the American Baptist Home Mission Society. Its motto, "North America for Christ," it has constantly and suc-

cessfully aimed to realize. In 1837 John M. Peck, the pioneer home missionary in Illinois and Missouri, could write: "The time was when not another man besides myself and colleague, Brother J. E. Welch, in the two States, of any denomination, could be found to take a bold and active stand in any of the benevolent movements of the age. Now I can count up zealous, active laborers and successful men by scores."

The operations of the society did not increase largely between 1836 and 1845. Only once between these dates did the receipts exceed those of the earlier date, and the receipts of the latter year were only \$18,675.68; yet by reason of the development of the aggressive missionary spirit on the fields cultivated, the work accomplished far more than kept pace with the receipts.

Mention has already been made of the dearth of denominational literature at the beginning of this period and of the efforts of Luther Rice and others to help forward the missionary and educational work of the General Convention by the publication of the "Latter Day Luminary" and the "Columbian Star." The supply of periodical literature was soon to become superabundant through private enterprise. There are so many people that think themselves capable of editing a paper, and it is so easy to figure out on paper a paying subscription list and a net profit from advertisements, that experiments without number were sure to be made. A few of those established before 1845, in some cases with change of name, have survived and have constantly increased in influence. "The Watchman," begun in 1819 as "The Christian Watchman," came into increased prominence (1838-48) under William Crowell, was successfully conducted for many years by J. W. Olmstead, assisted by L. E. Smith and others, absorbed "The Christian Reflector" (1848)

and "The Christian Era" (1875), and, under G. E. Horr, still flourishes. "The Examiner" furnishes a remarkable case of newspaper evolution. It represents all that is left of some seven papers. "The New York Baptist Register," founded at Utica about 1824, having absorbed in 1825 a missionary quarterly begun in 1814 or earlier, was in 1855 amalgamated with "The New York Recorder," an outgrowth (1845) of "The Baptist Advocate" (1839), which had absorbed "The Gospel Witness" (begun in 1835). S. S. Cutting and M. B. Anderson, as editors of "The Recorder," had given to that paper a leading place among religious journals. "The Recorder and Register" was purchased by Edward Bright and S. S. Cutting in 1855, when its name was changed to "The Examiner." In 1849 "The New York Chronicle" had been started by O. B. Judd, and in 1855 it was edited and controlled by J. S. Backus and Pharcellus Church. In 1863 Dr. Church became sole proprietor and purchased, besides, "The Christian Chronicle," of Philadelphia, edited by J. S. Dickerson. In 1865 "The Chronicle" was united with "The Examiner." Under Edward Bright "The Examiner and Chronicle" (afterward shortened to "The Examiner") attained to the leading position in Baptist journalism. Lately (1894) "The National Baptist," of Philadelphia, was purchased by "The Examiner," and its able editor, H. L. Wayland, made a member of the staff. On the death of Dr. Bright (June, 1894), Henry C. Vedder, one of the most accomplished religious journalists of the time, succeeded to the editorial control of the paper, having been since 1876 one of its chief editorial writers. "The Religious Herald," begun in 1828 by William Sands, a practical printer, has had a continuous and highly honorable existence to the present time. Under the editorial direction of D. Shaver (1857 onward) it became one of

the most influential papers in the South. Under J. B. Jeter and A. E. Dickinson (1865 onward) its position was still further strengthened. Dr. Jeter was one of the ablest Baptists the South has possessed, and Dr. Dickinson is still one of the most versatile and influential of editors. With him is worthily associated at present Dr. W. E. Hatcher. Other papers whose publication was begun before 1845 and which have survived are: "The Western Recorder" (1835), ably edited at present by T. T. Eaton, and representing the Baptist conservatism of the South; "The Journal and Messenger," of Cincinnati, begun in 1831 as "The Baptist Weekly Journal," and united with "The Christian Messenger" in 1851, has been successfully conducted by G. W. Lasher since 1876; "The Baptist," of Tennessee (1835), edited for many years (1846 onward) by J. R. Graves, and the leading exponent of "Old-Landmarkism"; "Zion's Advocate" (1828), the organ of the Baptists of Maine, ably conducted since 1873 by Henry S. Burrage, noted as historical scholar and author; "The Christian Secretary," of Connecticut (1822), ably edited for many years by S. D. Phelps. "The Columbian Star" (1822), founded by Luther Rice as the organ of the schemes of the Convention, edited in Philadelphia (1826-28) by W. T. Brantly as "The Columbian Star" and "The Christian Index," purchased by Jesse Mercer and transferred to Georgia in 1833, presented by him to the Georgia Baptist Convention in 1840, has from the beginning had a highly useful career. Its most brilliant editor was the late Henry Holcombe Tucker, one of the ablest educators and most eloquent preachers that the South has produced.

The need of a denominational review early came to be felt, and in 1836 "The Christian Review" was started as a quarterly, with J. D. Knowles as editor. He was succeeded by Barnas Sears. Among the later noted editors

were S. S. Cutting, G. B. Taylor, and E. G. Robinson. "The Review" was discontinued in 1863. The American Baptist Publication Society issued an able quarterly (1867-77), edited at first by L. E. Smith and afterward by President H. G. Weston. Under the name "The Baptist Quarterly Review" J. R. Baumes attempted to supply the denominational need from 1878 to 1885, when he sold it to a company in New York, who changed its name to "The Baptist Quarterly" and published it until 1892, with R. S. MacArthur and H. C. Vedder as editors. "The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle," edited at first by R. Babcock and J. O. Choules, and afterward by Enoch Hutchinson, was published in New York from 1842 to 1850. It was a publication of much merit and contains a vast amount of valuable historical matter.

While religious journalism might safely be left to individual enterprise, there were other kinds of publication that called loudly for united denominational effort. The need of religious tracts free from bias against Baptist teaching and inculcating Baptist principles came to be keenly felt early in the present period. A number of tract societies had been formed by Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and others, and the Methodists were reaping rich advantages from their well-established and energetically conducted Book Concern. The suggestion that led to the formation of a Baptist tract society seems to have come from Noah Davis, a zealous young minister who had studied under Staughton and Chase in Philadelphia and afterward in Columbian College. In February, 1824, he addressed a communication to J. D. Knowles, then editor of "The Columbian Star," which led to the calling of a meeting and the organization of the Baptist General Tract Society, with its headquarters at Washington. "I have been thinking for some time," he wrote, "how a tract so-

ciety can be got up in Washington which shall hold the same place among the Baptists that the American Tract Society does among the Congregationalists. I feel very much the necessity of having tracts to scatter in the waste places. It is a plan of doing good but little known among Baptists." That it should be located in Washington rather than in a great publishing center like Philadelphia was in accord with the design of Rice and others to make the national capital the center of denominational activity. After due announcement in "The Columbian Star," a meeting was held on February 20th for the formation of the society. Dr. Staughton presided, and a constitution drafted by Knowles was amended and adopted. The organization was styled the Baptist General Tract Society, and provision was made for the publication and distribution of tracts, the appointment of subordinate agents, the establishment of depositories, and the formation of auxiliary societies. O. B. Brown was appointed president, George Wood agent, and Luther Rice, already overwhelmed with responsibilities, treasurer. The society at once received the cordial support of the leaders of the denomination North and South, and beginning in a very small way soon extended its operations so as to become one of the most important and successful of our denominational enterprises. The receipts, which were for the first year \$373.80, amounted to \$20,803.78 for the year ending in April, 1845. As early as 1826, owing to great inconvenience and loss from being at a distance from a publishing and distributing center, the society removed its headquarters to Philadelphia. The complications that had arisen in connection with Columbian College doubtless facilitated the transfer. In 1840 a revised constitution was adopted and the name of the society changed to the American Baptist Publication Society. Besides publish-

ing a large number of valuable tracts, the society issued popular periodicals and published a number of denominational books. Its missionary work, accomplished through colporteurs, who have traversed the length and breadth of the land distributing literature, preaching in destitute places, establishing Sunday-schools, etc., has been abundant and effective. Sunday-school work is distinctly recognized in the new constitution and has since 1840 been pushed with great vigor. The society is said to have been the first in America to engage in colportage.

The American Bible Society, formed in 1816, was an undenominational institution, in which Baptists freely joined. Before 1836 they had contributed more than \$170,000 to its funds, and when Judson's Burmese New Testament was completed in 1832 and his complete Burmese Bible in 1834, the board of the Triennial Convention asked for and received appropriations toward printing and circulating these versions. The total amount received was \$19,700. In 1833 the board of the Triennial Convention had passed the following resolution: "That all missionaries of the board who are, or shall be, engaged in translating the Scriptures, be instructed to endeavor, by earnest prayer and diligent study, to ascertain the precise meaning of the original text, to express that meaning as exactly as the nature of the languages into which they translate the Bible will permit, and to transfer no words which are capable of being literally translated." With this position Judson was in complete accord. In 1835 application was made to the American Bible Society for funds to aid in printing the Bengali Scriptures prepared by English Baptist missionaries on the principle adopted by the American Baptist board. It was stated in the application that the words "baptize" and "baptism" had been rendered by words meaning "immerse" and "immersion," and that the Bible

Society at Calcutta had on this account refused to aid in its circulation. The application was referred to a committee of seven, one for each leading denomination. The Baptist member seems to have been alone in insisting that the grant be made, or that it be not refused on the ground of the rendering instead of the transference of the words mentioned. In February, 1836, after prolonged discussion, the board of managers of the American Bible Society passed the following resolution by a vote of thirty to fourteen: "That in appropriating money for translating, printing, or distributing the Sacred Scriptures in foreign languages, the managers feel at liberty to encourage only such versions as conform in the principle of their translation to the common English version; at least so far that all the religious denominations represented in this society can consistently use and circulate said versions in their several schools and communities." This action was confirmed in the following May by the society at its annual meeting. A protest, which the board refused to receive or allow to be read, was presented by the Baptist members of the board of managers. The following extract will give its purport: "Conscientiously believing that every translator of the Bible is under a sacred obligation to regard the original Hebrew and Greek as the only standard, and neither to misrepresent nor conceal the least portion of divine truth, but to transmit into his version, with all possible fidelity, the precise meaning of the inspired text; believing, too, that while the constitution of the American Bible Society proposes to aid in the circulation of the Scriptures 'in other countries, whether Christian, Mahomedan, or pagan,' it nowhere expresses any purpose of requiring that the translations into foreign tongues shall be conformed in principle to the English version; and, further, believing that the Baptist denomination, as a con-

stituent member of the society, and upon the principle of a fair co-partnership, to which it has brought its full share of capital and of labor, is entitled to a portion of the appropriations made for distributing the Bible at home and abroad; and that the adoption, by the board, of any rule of action not recognized in the constitution, and tending to exclude the said denomination from these advantages, is a violation of the constitutional compact, a virtual dissolution of the original firm, and on principles of both law and equity would oblige the American Bible Society to refund a proper share of the capital now in their possession, . . . the undersigned members, as aforesaid, of the board of managers do hereby protest against the principle and bearing of the said resolution." The signers then proceed to give fourteen definite reasons for their action. The names affixed are Spencer H. Cone, Archibald Mac-lay, Jonathan Going, Charles G. Somers, William Judd, William Colgate, Charles C. P. Crosby, William Winton, Octavius Winslow, Luke Baker, M.D., and Samuel Barnard. T. R. Green joined in the protest, giving reasons of his own.

It may be observed that the treasury of the society was "full to overflowing," and the only reason for refusing funds for the Baptist version in question was the fact that the Greek words for "baptize" and "baptism" were rendered literally according to the best pedobaptist lexicographers.

On May 12, 1836, the day after the American Bible Society approved of the resolution of its board, one hundred and twenty leading Baptists met in the Oliver Street Baptist Church, of New York, and formed the American and Foreign Bible Society, the "single object" of which was declared to be "to promote a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures in the most faithful versions that can be

procured." Obstacles were put in the way of their obtaining a charter, and it was not until 1848 that incorporation was secured. In 1837 "the largest and most intelligent assemblage of Baptist ministers and laymen" that had ever been held, consisting of three hundred and ninety delegates from twenty-three States, assembled in Philadelphia in this interest. The organization was completed, and it was resolved "that, under existing circumstances, it is the indispensable duty of the Baptist denomination to organize a distinct society for the purpose of aiding in the translation, printing, and circulation of the Scriptures." It was further resolved "that the society confine its efforts, during the ensuing year, to the circulation of the word of God in foreign tongues." This last resolution was a result of an unwillingness on the part of some to attempt to compete with the American Bible Society on the home field, or to lose the advantages of participating, as a denomination, in the large facilities for Bible publication and circulation that Baptists had aided in creating. The new society did a noble work in aiding in the publication of versions of the Scriptures in Burmah and in India. Divided counsels, however, soon threatened the existence of the society and the unity and harmony of the denomination. As its operations were to be confined to aiding missionaries in publishing their versions, many brethren could see no reason why the work should not be done by the Foreign Mission Board, and regarded the maintenance of a special agency as superfluous. Others insisted on the application of the principle of faithful versions, with a rendering of the words for "baptize" and "baptism," to English versions, and when a majority of the society had resolved (May 25, 1850) "that this society, in its issues and circulation of the English Scriptures, shall be restricted to the commonly received version, without note or comment,"

the advocates of "translation" *versus* "transferring" met in New York, at the house of William Colgate (May 27, 1850), and organized the American Bible Union, the object of which was declared to be "procuring and circulating the most faithful versions of the Sacred Scriptures in all languages."

Thus the American Bible Union came at once into the sharpest rivalry with the American and Foreign Bible Society, and so far as this question was concerned the denomination was grievously divided. As there will be no opportunity to revert to this matter, it may be added here that the Bible Union procured the services of some of the most eminent scholars in the denomination, notably Drs. Thomas J. Conant and Horatio B. Hackett, and published annotated versions of the New Testament books and of a large number of the Old. These versions are of high critical merit and have no doubt been of considerable value to students; but they failed to supplant the authorized version in popular use. The pronounced hostility of the friends of the American and Foreign Bible Society and the lack of popular interest in a revised version doubtless made the work of the Bible Union largely ineffective. On the other hand, the former society was antagonized by friends of the Bible Union and those of the Missionary Union; and its sources of supply were soon largely cut off. Many had come to feel that the existence of these two rival and antagonistic societies constituted a serious obstacle to denominational unity and progress. Negotiations with the American Bible Society were reopened in 1879, but failed to result in any material modification of the society's previous action. In February, 1882, Dr. Edward Bright, who had taken a deep interest in the Bible controversies, and who was deeply concerned for the unification of the denomination, published a brief article in

"The Examiner," of which he was editor, expressing his conviction that Baptists could not expect fair treatment from the American Bible Society, which had "made itself the narrowest sort of a pedobaptist institution," and recommending that Baptists "betake themselves, with self-respecting dignity and fidelity, to the doing of their own Bible work through the American Baptist Missionary Union and the American Baptist Publication Society." This recommendation was carried out at a great mass-meeting of the denomination at Saratoga in May, 1883. The two rival societies, after an ineffective struggle against overwhelming denominational sentiment, quietly went out of existence, the Missionary Union assuming entire responsibility for foreign Bible work and the Publication Society undertaking to circulate the Bible Union version as well as the Anglo-American revised version. Thus was settled one of the most troublesome controversies in which the denomination was ever involved, and the settlement proved complete.

Reference has already been made to the obstacles presented to missionary and educational enterprise by ignorance and prejudice. The friends of education and missions in 1814 constituted a small minority of the denomination. Many Baptists from the beginning actively opposed the advance movement, and their opposition increased in bitterness as the missionary and educational enterprise went forward. The anti-missionary movement constitutes the saddest and most discreditable feature of modern Baptist history, as the highly successful missionary movement constitutes one of the chief glories of the denomination.

From 1820 onward the anti-effort Baptists became aggressive and in many cases malignant. The formation of the State Conventions brought them out into pronounced hostility to missions, education, Sunday-schools, Bible and

tract societies, and in general to what they were pleased to style "human institutions." The Conventions organized to promote these and like agencies for the spread of the gospel were usually constituted by a few representatives of a few Associations. It was impossible to induce a majority of the delegates of most of the Associations to appoint delegates for the formation of State organizations. The persistent efforts of the zealous men who had the cause of missions and education at heart to extend the sphere of the influence of the Conventions and to secure associational action in favor of the enterprises of the denomination aroused the anti-effort party to almost fanatical opposition. In many cases where an Association voted to take up the enterprises of the denomination the minority withdrew and constituted a new Association. In order to guard against the encroachment of "human institutions" upon such new domains the anti-effort Associations in many instances passed resolutions disfellowshipping any church that should take any part in missionary or educational enterprises, and churches of this persuasion made such action on the part of individual members a matter of discipline. The Hepzibah Association of Georgia rejected in 1826 the proposal of two of its churches that messengers be sent to view the order of the General Association (Convention), and the decorum of the body was so altered as to make it disorderly for any brother to move for a correspondence, either by letter or messenger, with any General Association or Committee, missionary society or board, and it was made the duty of the moderator to reprove any such violation of the decorum. A few specimens of the utterances of individuals and Associations of the anti-effort party will suffice to illustrate the spirit of the movement. The passages quoted are mild and decorous in comparison with others that might be given. An

Alabama minister wrote: "I have known some preachers who at first thought all benevolent institutions were wrong but the Foreign Missions; and after a while they would receive another trait of the beast as right, and so on until they would receive all but the tail (Temperance Societies); and *that* they would oppose with all their might for awhile, but finding it was connected with the body, they would swallow that. I will tell you, my brother, what it makes me think of: it is just like a snake trying to swallow a squirrel. It will begin at the head and swallow that first, and so on until it comes to the tail. Then it tries every stratagem to get rid of swallowing the tail; but finding it is connected with the body, it must either vomit all back or take down the tail, although averse to it; for if they vomit up the body and head, they will be laughed at for saying and contending that those things are right." Another minister in the same State wrote: "Do not forget the enemy [missionaries], bear them in mind; the howling destructive wolves, the ravenous dogs, and the filthy, and their numerous whelps. By a minute observation and the consultation of the sacred, never-failing, descriptive chart, even their physiognomy in dress, mien, and carriage, and many other indented, indelible, descriptive marks, too tedious at present to write. The wolfish smell is enough to alarm, to create suspicion, and to ascertain; the dogs' teeth are noted, and the wolves for their peculiar and distinct howl," etc. Another compared "theological schools to make preachers" to "the bottomless pit spoken of in Revelations." "For," he added, "a bottomless pit has no foundation in the Scriptures as an institution of God." A Georgia minister is said to have declared that "if an angel was to come from heaven and declare the missionary cause was of God, he would not believe it." If it be true that "he immediately lost his speech, and remained

in that deplorable situation until he died," as is related on credible authority, it was no more than such blasphemy deserved. The following is from a circular letter of one of the Alabama anti-effort Associations: "And now for a moment let us notice the language of some of the votaries of the new system. They say God complains—my people perish for lack of knowledge. They also say that if we urge on the mighty cause of education, Bible and tract distribution, and through missionary effort, we know that the millennial day will soon dawn upon the world. They entreat you to hasten, for if we pause—if we hesitate—people will perish forever. . . . But again we are told by some that we need an improved ministry; or, in other words, an educated ministry. As to the education we know no objection, provided it is received before a call to the ministry, for Paul says, 'Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.' It is also said that pious men that are called of God to preach his gospel—that they, in their ignorance, will ordain other ignorant men, and in that way a great deal of harm will be done. Oh, what an insult to Deity, that men should say that God has no power to qualify men for the ministry, after he has called them!" Another Alabama Association declared itself as follows: "We must decline all fellowship for, or correspondence with, such Associations and professors of the Baptists, or of any other name, as have departed from the faith and order of the gospel, or have attempted to add to the divine decree any of the institutions of human inventions, of whatever name they may be called. The want of union where all this variety of sentiment has existed has been painfully felt by the most of our churches and Associations, as long as ever they have suffered that woman Jezebel to hold a place among us. She calls herself a prophetess, but her efforts are directed to the pro-

duction of a strange sect, which, whenever brought forth, causes divisions, trouble, and distress; and because she claims to be a prophetess, she excites the sympathies of many pleaders for her. But blessed be the name of our God, he has interposed his seasonable aid in our behalf, has cast her ladyship into a bed, and has killed, and, if we mistake not, is now killing her children with death." This and the preceding writing were set forth as late as 1838.

Alabama was settled largely from western Georgia, where Baptists of the more illiberal type abounded. For this reason the friends of missions had more to contend with here than in many other communities; but their zeal triumphed over obstacles, and the missionary cause went gloriously forward. But throughout the South and the West, and even in many of the older communities in the East, the missionary movement, with its adjuncts, was opposed with a rancor and a persistence that greatly tried the faith and the patience of evangelical Baptists.

The most striking instance of the temporary triumph of the anti-missionary cause is furnished by the history of the Baptists of Tennessee. At the beginning of the present period nearly all of the churches were friendly to the foreign mission cause. Rice made several tours of the churches and was nearly everywhere well received. He secured the organization of a State Foreign Mission Society, and several of the leading Associations became directly auxiliary to the General Convention. Until after 1820 opposition to missions did not assume an organized or malignant form. Several circumstances combined to make the great majority of the Baptists of the State anti-missionary, so that, in the words of a contemporary, "the current of prejudice had gradually swollen, until now no one dared to resist it. Not a man ventured to open his

mouth in favor of any benevolent enterprise or action. The missionary societies were dissolved, and the Associations rescinded all their resolutions by which they were in any way connected with these measures, and, in this respect, the spirit of death rested upon the whole people! Subsequently, and until the present time [1845], this state of things has been kept up, wherever it was possible, by the same means, and by industriously circulating, in addition, such papers as 'The Old-Baptist Banner,' of Tennessee, 'The Primitive Baptist,' of North Carolina, and 'The Signs of the Times,' of New York."

A striking illustration of the decline of interest in foreign missions under the influences referred to is found in the foreign mission contributions from Ohio. In 1820 \$547.09 were contributed. Nothing was received from the State from 1821 to 1829, when \$10 were contributed. The contribution for 1830 was \$5. In 1821-22 \$985.69 were contributed for the Indian mission at Fort Wayne, but support was entirely withdrawn from this as well as from the foreign work during the following years. In 1845, of the thirty-four Virginia Associations, twelve, including the old Ketokton, were anti-missionary.

This lamentable retrograde movement, which affected the neighboring States on all sides, may be partially accounted for as follows: 1. The general illiteracy of the population, resulting from the fact that the territory was newly settled and that the population had been thoroughly occupied in clearing the land and bringing it into cultivation. 2. The general prevalence of a high type of Calvinistic doctrine, tending to the disparagement of human agency. This in the hands of illiterate but strong-willed ministers, who felt that their influence would be lost if the mission cause with its educational adjuncts should triumph, became a leading ground for opposing missions and edu-

cation. 3. The encroachments of the Methodists, the Cumberland Presbyterians, and the followers of Alexander Campbell, with their Arminian teachings, tended, by arousing the antagonism of these hyper-Calvinistic Baptists, to drive them to the extremes of antinomianism. 4. The activity of Daniel Parker, whose baleful influence in opposition to missions far surpassed that of any other individual. He is thus described by J. M. Peck: "Raised on the frontiers of Georgia, without education, uncouth in manners, slovenly in dress, diminutive in person, unprepossessing in appearance, with shriveled features and a small, piercing eye, few men, for a series of years, have exerted wider influence on the lower and less educated class of frontier people. With a zeal and enthusiasm bordering on insanity, firmness that amounted to obstinacy, and perseverance that would have done honor to a good cause, Daniel Parker exerted himself to the utmost to induce the churches within his range to declare non-fellowship with all Baptists who united with any missionary or other benevolent (or, as he called them, newfangled) societies. He possessed a mind of singular and original cast. In doctrine he was an antinomian from the first, but he could describe the process of conviction and the joys of conversion, and of dependence on God, with peculiar feeling and effect. . . . He fully believed, and produced the impression on others, that he spoke by immediate inspiration. Repeatedly have we heard him when his mind seemed to rise above its own powers, and he would discourse for a few moments on the divine attributes, or some doctrinal subject, with such brilliancy of thought and force and correctness of language as would astonish men of education and talents. Then, again, it would seem as though he was perfectly bewildered in a mist of abstruse subtleties." That such a man should have

wielded a vast and widespread influence is no more than might have been expected, especially as his teachings appealed powerfully to the selfish instincts of the class of men with whom he had to deal. Under such inspiration the hitherto latent and moderately expressed opposition to missions, Bible societies, education, tract and temperance societies, Sunday-schools, prayer-meetings, and other evangelizing agencies was fanned into a fury, not only in Tennessee and the Southwest, but to a greater or less extent throughout the country. It may be added that Parker combined with the fatalistic antinomianism that was common to the anti-effort party a crude and disgusting type of gnostic dualism. This was embodied in certain pamphlets published in 1826-29 on the doctrine of Two Seeds.¹

It is highly probable that, apart from the development among Baptists of this unevangelical type of Calvinism, with its bigotry and intolerance, Methodists and Cumberland Presbyterians would have made their way in regions preoccupied by Baptists far more slowly than was actually the case. A large proportion of the Baptists of the Southwest were so perverse in doctrine and so unamiable in spirit that milder and more evangelical types of Christianity were imperatively called for, and those who had once been repelled by the extravagances of so-called Baptists were more likely to be attracted by non-Baptist parties than by Baptists of a more evangelical type. It is probable, moreover, that if the Baptists of the Southwest had been thoroughly evangelical the secession under Alexander Campbell would never have occurred. A contemporary writer, in attempting to account for the prevalence of

¹ For an account of Parker's doctrines, and statistical and other information about anti-missionary Baptists in general, see vol. i. of the present series, pp. 45-54. According to Dr. Carroll, Parker was born in Virginia, and not in Georgia, as stated by Peck in the passage quoted above.

anti-missionary sentiment in Tennessee up to 1845, remarks: "Some of the prime friends of missions [among the Baptists] became converts to Mr. Alexander Campbell's system, and joined him. Thus missions became beyond measure odious." The spread, if not the rise, of the Disciples, as a sect, was undoubtedly due far more to the excrescences that had well-nigh destroyed the life of the Baptist denomination throughout extended regions than to anything inherent in the Baptist system; and some of the erroneous features of the Disciples' system may have been a result of extreme reaction against the errors of unevangelical Baptists.

Notwithstanding the desperate efforts to destroy the missionary and educational causes, they gained steadily in popular favor. By 1845 the Board of Foreign Missions was sustaining 17 missions (of which 6 were among North American Indians), 130 stations and out-stations, 109 missionaries and assistants (of whom 42 were preachers), and 123 native preachers and assistants. There had been organized 79 churches, which had a membership of more than 8000. The number of baptisms during the year had been 2593. The receipts for the year ending April, 1845, were \$82,302.95. This amount had been exceeded only once, in 1839, when it reached \$109,135.21. The missions of the board, outside of America, were as follows: 3 in Europe (France, Germany and Denmark, and Greece), 1 in West Africa, and 7 in Asia (Burmah, India, Assam, Siam, and China). The Home Mission Society reported for the same year cash receipts of \$18,675.68 (with \$30,625.21 reported as raised by State Conventions for similar work). It employed during the year 99 missionaries in eighteen States. The Mississippi Valley was "still the principal theater of its action." In connection with the society 51 churches had been constituted during the year

and 32 ministers ordained; 801 had been added to its churches and stations by baptism; and 145 Sunday-schools had been established, with 3910 pupils. During the same year the American and Foreign Bible Society received \$34,930 and did a large home and foreign work in Bible publication and distribution. The receipts of the Publication Society for the same year were \$20,803.78, and it reported a large and beneficent activity.

By 1844 the denomination had reached a membership in the United States of 720,046, with 9385 churches and 6364 ministers. It will be remembered that in 1812 the Baptists of the United States numbered 172,972, and in 1814, the beginning of the present period, about 200,000. In thirty years the denomination had increased about 260 percent. During this period the population of the United States had increased from 7,210,969 to 17,227,454, or less than 140 percent. (census figures for 1810 and 1840).

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.¹

LONG before 1844 the slavery question had come to be agitated in Baptist circles. The Baptists of the South had, as a body, identified themselves with the institution, and were prepared not only to practice it, but to defend it with pen and sword. The sentiment against domestic slavery grew rapidly at the North, and many Baptists were coming to feel that duty required them not only to protest against the enslavement of their fellow-men and brethren in Christ, but to use every practicable means for the overthrow of an institution which they looked upon as un-Christian and immoral. Up to 1844 Baptists of the North and South had heartily coöperated in the Triennial Convention and in the various general denominational societies that had gathered around this body. The Southern churches had contributed their full share toward the funds of these societies, and many of the ablest leaders in general denominational work were Southern men.

In the winter of 1839-40 the Board of Foreign Missions passed a resolution asserting the absolute neutrality of the board on the slavery question. This resolution was reënnacted in 1843 at the Albany anniversaries. It was inevi-

¹ See "Annual Reports of the S. B. C."; Tupper, "Dec. of For. Miss."; Cuthbert, "R. Fuller"; Broadus, "J. P. Boyce"; "Bapt. Memorial," 1845 *seq.*; Fuller and Wayland, "Letters on Domestic Slavery"; Sampey, "Southern Bapt. Theol. Sem."; Cathcart; State denominational histories as in Bibliography.

table that at the great public gatherings brethren of strong antislavery convictions and impulsive temperament should express their sentiments on this question in such a way as to offend their Southern brethren, who were highly sensitive to any unfavorable allusion to an institution with which they and their constituents were so fully identified.

In the Triennial Convention for 1844, Richard Fuller, of South Carolina, introduced the following resolution, with the hope of rigorously excluding any allusion to slavery in the meetings of the body and thus making possible continued coöperation of North and South: "Whereas, Some misapprehension exists in certain parts of the country as to the design or character of this Convention, and it is most desirable that such misapprehension should be removed; therefore, Resolved, That this Convention is a corporation with limited powers, for a specific purpose defined in its constitution; and therefore, that its members are delegated to meet solely for the transaction of business prescribed by the said constitution; and that coöperation in this body does not involve nor imply any concert or sympathy as to any matters foreign from the object designated as aforesaid." This resolution was seconded by Spencer H. Cone and supported by William Hague, J. B. Jeter, and others, but was strongly opposed by Nathaniel Colver, of Massachusetts, who did not wish to be fettered in respect to any subject. It was finally withdrawn to make way for the following, which was unanimously adopted: "Whereas, There exists in various sections of our country an impression that our present organization involves the fellowship of the institution of domestic slavery, or of certain associations which are designed to oppose this institution; Resolved, That in coöperating together as members of this Convention in the work of Foreign Missions, we disclaim all sanction, either express or implied,

whether of slavery or of antislavery, but as individuals we are perfectly free both to express and promote our own views on these subjects in a Christian manner and spirit." In the course of the discussion Dr. Fuller, one of the ablest and most moderate of the Southern leaders, is said to have remarked that he was himself entirely calm on the subject of slavery. He had examined it; he had felt deeply upon it. He was not convinced that slavery is a sin personally; he regarded it as a great evil; his brethren at the South did not; he hoped and prayed that the time would soon come when it would be done away. Some time after the Convention of 1844 the Board of Foreign Missions was said to have procured the resignation of John Bushyhead, a highly respected Indian Baptist preacher, on the ground that he was a slave-holder. The impression commonly prevailed in the South thenceforth that slave-holders would be rigorously excluded from appointment as missionaries, agents, or officers of the board.

In 1844 Richard Fuller addressed a communication to the editor of "*The Christian Reflector*," in reply to certain antislavery utterances that had appeared in that journal. He sought to fortify his position by referring to certain statements in Wayland's "*Elements of Moral Science*." As Wayland was a pronounced, though moderate, antislavery man, such a use of his authority drew forth an explanation of his position. Wayland represented the best culture, wisdom, and spirit of the Northern Baptists, as did Fuller those of the Southern Baptists. It was fortunate that two such men should be led to discuss a question of so vital importance. It need scarcely be said that both writers were scrupulously courteous and as conciliatory as the circumstances would allow. Fuller's attitude toward this question has already been referred to. Both writers considered the question on ethical and Scriptural grounds,

reaching opposite conclusions as to what is allowable for American Christians of the nineteenth century. It is not likely that many converts were gained to either side by this somewhat prolonged discussion, but it is probable that on both sides the bitterness of feeling aroused by the anti-slavery agitation was somewhat allayed. These controversial papers were published in a volume early in 1845, entitled "Letters on Domestic Slavery."

The Alabama State Convention was the first Southern body to memorialize the Foreign Mission Board with respect to its understood purpose to discriminate against slave-holders in the making of appointments. The document thus begins: "Whereas, The holding of property in African negro slaves has for some years excited discussion, as a question of morals, between different portions of the Baptist denomination united in benevolent enterprise; and by a large portion of our brethren is now imputed to the slave-holders in these Southern and Southwestern States, as a sin at once grievous, palpable, and disqualifying; 1. Resolved, . . . that when one party to a voluntary compact among Christian brethren is not willing to acknowledge the entire social equality with the other, as to all the privileges and benefits of the union, nor even to refrain from impeachment and annoyance, united efforts between such parties, even in the sacred cause of Christian benevolence, cease to be agreeable, useful, or proper. 2. Resolved, That our duty at this crisis requires us to demand from the proper authorities in all those bodies to whose funds we have contributed, or with whom we have in any way been connected, the distinct, explicit avowal that slave-holders are eligible, and entitled, equally with non-slave-holders, to all the privileges and immunities of their several unions; and especially to receive any agency, mission, or other appointment, which may run within the scope of their

operations or duties." It is insisted that in case the moral character of an applicant shall be called in question an appeal shall be allowed to the church of which he is a member. No funds are to be forwarded to these societies until satisfactory answers shall have been received.

The Foreign Mission Board replied in a dignified and conciliatory way, but refused to recognize the right of any one, slave-holder or non-slave-holder, to appointment to positions at the disposal of the board. "In the thirty years in which the board has existed, no slave-holder, to our knowledge, has applied to be a missionary. And, as we send out no domestics or servants, such an event as a missionary taking slaves with him, were it morally right, could not, in accordance with all our past arrangements or present plans, possibly occur. If, however, any one should offer himself as a missionary, having slaves, and should insist on retaining them as his property, we could not appoint him. One thing is certain, we can never be a party to any arrangement which would imply approbation of slavery."

This decision of the board led to the formal withdrawal of the various Southern State Conventions and auxiliary foreign mission societies. At the suggestion of the board of the Foreign Missionary Society of Virginia, Southern Baptists were invited to meet in convention at Augusta, Ga., in May, 1845. In the meantime the national anniversaries of the denomination were held at Providence. The report of a committee appointed by the American Baptist Home Mission Society the previous year, to take into consideration the subject of an amicable dissolution of the society, was the occasion of a prolonged discussion. President Wayland used his great influence in vain to prevent precipitate action; but radical antislavery sentiment on the one hand, and Southern sensitiveness on the other,

made further coöperation impracticable. The necessity for division was bewailed by the great majority of the denomination, but it was clearly recognized. A committee, consisting of Maginnis, Tucker, Wayland, Sears, Webb, Taylor, and Duncan, reported in favor of an amicable arrangement by which the name and charter of the society should remain in the hands of the Northern Baptists, and all claims of contributors should be fairly and equitably adjusted. This report was adopted.

The Alabama resolutions were considered by the Foreign Mission Board, and the action of the executive, above given, was virtually confirmed. The report of a committee of which President Wayland was chairman, expressing approval of the action of the executive, was adopted after much discussion. The report shows the conciliatory disposition of the Northern leaders, and their conviction of the impracticability of yielding to the demands of the South. It is as follows: "1. The spirit of the constitution of the General Convention, as well as the history of its proceedings from the beginning, renders it apparent that all the members of the Baptist denomination in good standing, whether at the North or the South, are constitutionally eligible to all appointments emanating either from the Convention or the board. 2. While this is the case, it is possible that contingencies may arise in which the carrying out of this principle might create the necessity of making appointments by which the brethren at the North would either in fact or in the opinion of the Christian community become responsible for institutions which they could not, with a good conscience, sanction. 3. Were such a case to occur, we would not desire our brethren to violate their convictions of duty by making such appointments, but should consider it incumbent on them to refer the case to the Convention for its decision."

Sentiment on both sides being as it was, division was inevitable. The attempt to coöperate would put such a restraint upon discussion as to chill the enthusiasm of brethren at the North, and there were enough rash men on both sides to insure a certain amount of unpleasantness at each meeting. Contributions to missions in both sections were sure to be largely affected by the feeling of uncertainty and by the irritation that would be involved in continued coöperation. On the other hand, the separation of North and South in home and foreign work would stimulate in the highest degree the activity of each. That the division should have been attended with so little bitterness was due to the high type of Christian character represented by the leaders on both sides. It would be difficult to find anywhere in ecclesiastical history an abler, wiser, nobler set of men than those who during these years gathered from North, South, East, and West, at the national anniversaries, to deliberate on the great interests of the denomination. Richard Fuller, Francis Wayland, W. B. Johnson, Spencer H. Cone, John M. Peck, William Colgate, Rufus Babcock, James B. Taylor, Baron Stow, Jesse H. Campbell, Barnas Sears, Basil Manly, George B. Ide, Adiel Sherwood, Daniel Sharp, William R. Williams, John L. Dagg, Jeremiah B. Jeter, Stephen W. Lynd, along with many others that might be named, formed in 1845 a galaxy of consecrated and cultivated talent. Many of the leaders of 1814 had passed away, among them Richard Furman, Jessé Mercer, Thomas Baldwin, Lucius Bolles, William Staughton, Luther Rice, Henry Holcombe, Jonathan Goring, and William T. Brantly. Most of these names are still household words among intelligent Baptists.

Great enthusiasm attended the organization of the Southern Baptist Convention, May 8-11, 1845. There were gathered in Augusta, Ga., three hundred and sev-

enty-seven delegates from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Kentucky, and the District of Columbia. Dr. W. B. Johnson, who had served for many years as president of the Triennial Convention, was appointed president; Hon. W. Lumpkin, of Georgia, and J. B. Taylor, of Virginia, vice-presidents; and Jesse Hartwell and James C. Crane, secretaries. A committee of two representatives from each State presented the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted: "That for peace and harmony, and in order to accomplish the greatest amount of good, and for the maintenance of those Scriptural principles on which the General Missionary Convention of the Baptist denomination of the United States was originally formed, it is proper that this Convention at once proceed to organize for the propagation of the gospel." Two boards of managers were constituted: one for foreign missions, with headquarters at Richmond, Va., and one for domestic missions, with headquarters at Marion, Ala. The officers of the former were: J. B. Jeter, president; C. D. Mallery, corresponding secretary; M. T. Sumner, recording secretary; and Archibald Thomas, treasurer; of the latter: Basil Manly, president; J. L. Reynolds, corresponding secretary; M. P. Jewett, recording secretary; and Thomas Chilton, treasurer. Each board had a vice-president for each State represented. Provision was made for triennial meetings, after the manner of the older Convention. The Fundamental Articles provide for the combination, for foreign and domestic mission work, and other important objects connected with the Redeemer's kingdom, of "such portions of the Baptist denomination in the United States as may desire a general organization for Christian benevolence, which shall fully respect the independence and equal rights of the churches." An address was sent forth by the Convention "to the brethren in the United

States; to the congregations connected with the respective churches; and to all candid men," the spirit of which will appear from the passages that follow: "A painful division has taken place in the missionary operations of the American Baptists. We would explain the origin, the principles, and the objects of that division, or the peculiar circumstances in which the organization of the Southern Baptist Convention became necessary. Let not the extent of this disunion be exaggerated. At the present time it involves only the foreign and domestic missions of the denomination. Northern and Southern Baptists are still brethren. They differ in no article of the faith. They are guided by the same principles of gospel order. Fanatical attempts have indeed been made, in some quarters, to exclude us of the South from Christian fellowship. We do not retort these attempts, and believe their extent to be comparatively limited. Our Christian fellowship is not, as we feel, a matter to be obtruded upon any one. We abide by that of our God, his dear Son, and all his baptized followers. The few ultra-Northern brethren to whom we allude must take what course they please. *Their* conduct has not influenced us in this movement. We do not regard the rupture as extending to foundation principles, nor can we think that the great body of our Northern brethren will so regard it."

An historical recital of the events that have led up to the separate organization of the Southern Baptists follows, involving the charge of departure from the original principles of the Convention and from the compromise resolution of the Convention of 1844 on the part of the Foreign Mission Board. "The PRINCIPLES of the Southern Baptist Convention," the document continues, ". . . are conservative; while they are also, as we trust, equitable and liberal. They purpose to do the Lord's work in the

way our fathers did it. . . . The constitution we adopt is precisely that of the original union; that in connection with which, throughout his missionary life, Adoniram Judson has lived, and under which Ann Judson and Boardman have died. We recede from it in no single step. We have constructed for our basis no new creed, acting in this matter upon a Baptist aversion for all creeds but the Bible. . . . We claim to have acted in the premises with liberality toward our Northern brethren. Thrust from the common platform of equal rights, between the Northern and Southern churches, we have but reconstructed that platform. . . . Have they thrust us off? We retain but one feeling in the case: *that we will not practically leave it on any account*, much less in obedience to such usurped authority, or in deference to such a manifest breach of trust as is here involved; a breach of covenant that looks various ways—heavenward and earthward. For we repeat, THEY WOULD FORBID US TO *speak unto* THE GENTILES. . . . ‘One thing is certain’—we must go everywhere preaching the word. ‘We can never be a party to any arrangement’ for monopolizing the gospel; any arrangement which, like that of the Autocratical Interdict of the North, would first drive us from our beloved colored people, of whom they prove that they know nothing comparatively, and from the much-wronged aborigines of the country; and then cut us off from the whitening fields of the heathen harvest-labor, to which by cogent appeals and solemn prayers they have so often protested that, without us, they were inadequate. . . . In parting with beloved brethren and old coadjutors in this cause, we could weep, and have wept, for ourselves and for them; but the season, as well of weeping as of vain jangling, is, we are constrained to believe, just now past. For years the pressure of men’s hands has been upon us far too heavily. Our brethren

have pressed upon every inch of our privileges and our sacred rights; but this only shall urge our gushing souls to yield proportionately of their renewed efforts to the Lord, to the church universal, and to a dying world; even as water pressed from without rises but the more within. Above all, the mountain pressure of our obligations to God, even our own God; to Christ, and him crucified; and to the personal and social blessings of the Holy Spirit and his influences, shall urge our little streams of water of life to flow forth; until every wilderness and desolate place within our reach (and what extent of the world's wilderness, wisely considered, is not within our reach?) 'shall be glad'—even at this passing calamity of division; and the deserts of unconverted human nature 'rejoice, and blossom as the rose.' "

The next Convention was appointed to be held in Richmond, June 10, 1846. At the appointed time about one hundred and fifty delegates assembled. The meeting was a most solemn and decorous one. The American and Foreign Bible Society, the American Baptist Publication Society, the American Sunday-school Union, and the Kentucky General Association sent corresponding messengers and expressed a willingness to coöperate with the Convention. It was resolved "that before the final vote upon questions of vital importance . . . the business of the Convention shall be suspended, and prayer offered up to Almighty God for the special guidance of his Spirit." The Foreign Board, provisionally appointed the year before, reported receipts during the year of about \$17,735 and a balance on hand of about \$15,500. The Northern society had refused to assign to this board a portion of the mission work that had been jointly undertaken, preferring to allow the missionaries themselves to select the board under which they would labor. J. L. Shuck, a missionary

to China, was present at the Convention and was under appointment to return as a missionary of the Southern board. S. C. Clopton and George Percy were under appointment for mission work in China. The former was solemnly ordained to the work during the Convention. The Foreign Board had already begun the publication of "The Southern Missionary Journal" (afterward named "The Foreign Mission Journal"). J. B. Taylor was appointed corresponding secretary of the Foreign Board. The provisional Board of Domestic Missions reported receipts of \$13,193 (including unpaid pledges). Six missionaries had been employed, but only a beginning had been made. A proposal by the board to plant missions in California and Mexico was stricken from the report on the ground that such proposal "might be construed into a political meaning." The needs of the colored population of the South were duly considered, and steps were taken looking to the evangelization of Africa. The following resolution, which was heartily adopted, indicates the attitude of Southern Baptists in 1846 toward the African race: "Resolved, That in view of the present condition of the African race, and in view of the indications of Divine Providence toward that portion of the great family of fallen men, we feel that a solemn obligation rests not only upon the Convention, but upon all Christians, to furnish them with the gospel and a suitable Christian ministry." It was thought that missionaries from the North would never be able to endure the climate of Africa, and that chief reliance must be placed upon colored missionaries. It was the opinion of the committee appointed to report on this matter that ten such might be at once provided for. It was decided to coöperate with the American and Foreign Bible Society at home and abroad.

A résumé of the work of the Convention in home and

foreign mission and Sunday-school work is all that is here practicable. From 1846 to 1860 the missionary work of the Convention was carried forward with marked enthusiasm and success. During the first thirteen years of the existence of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Convention the Baptists of the South contributed about seven times as much money for this purpose as they had contributed through the American Baptist Home Mission Society during the preceding thirteen years. Every department of denominational life was quickened by the increased responsibility felt and by the increased confidence that sprang from direct control. Heretofore the boards had all been located at the North and Conventions were never held in the South. Interest was intensified by the possession of boards and by the possibility of attending the Conventions in larger numbers. Not only did the denomination greatly increase in numbers and in liberality under the new arrangement, but the antinomian and anti-missionary spirit that was rife throughout the South speedily gave place to the triumphant missionary spirit.

The Home Mission Board was located at Marion, Ala., till 1882, when it was transferred to Atlanta, Ga. The prosperity of the home mission cause to the outbreak of the war was remarkable. Up to 1861 the board had "sent forth 750 missionaries, added 15,000 members to the churches, built about 200 houses of worship, constituted 200 new churches, and had collected and disbursed about \$300,000." During the Civil War the work of the board was chiefly in the armies, where its numerous missionaries did a noble and fruitful work. A period of depression and discouragement followed the war. Not only was the country impoverished and disorganized, but the affairs of the board seem to have been ill managed. It became involved in debt, and no enthusiasm could be aroused in the churches.

Receipts fell short of \$20,000 a year, and much of this was required for interest and expenses. Most of the money raised just after the war came from Kentucky, Missouri, and Maryland, where losses in consequence of the war had been comparatively slight. The number of missionaries employed in 1881-82 was only 36, and only 333 additions by baptism were reported. With the reorganization of the board and its transference to Atlanta a period of prosperity was inaugurated. The number of missionaries employed rose in 1883 to 95, in 1884 to 144, in 1885 to 187, in 1886 to 255, in 1888 to 287, in 1889 to 324, in 1891 to 406. A slight retrenchment was found to be necessary in the succeeding years, and the number employed in 1894 was only 381. This work has been distributed throughout the Southern States, Indian Territory, Oklahoma, and Cuba. In the older States most of the home mission work is accomplished by the agency of the State Conventions. Texas has (in 1894) the largest number of missionaries, namely, 105; Florida has 51, West Arkansas and Indian Territory, 54, Kentucky, 24, Arkansas, 23, Mississippi, 22, Oklahoma, 12, while the rest of the States have from 1 to 10 each. A large amount of work is done in coöperation with the State Conventions.

The work accomplished by the board among the Indians of the Indian Territory is said to have been one of the most remarkable in the history of modern missions. According to a recent report of the board, "the membership among them, in proportion to population, is now equal to that of our strongest Baptist States. They have been reclaimed from barbarism. They support a well-organized government. They have opened farms, builded houses, established schools, and are prepared, if they so desired, to enter this great federation of States as a constituent member." There are now in the Indian Territory 16

Associations, 301 churches, and 13,844 members. The work accomplished in Texas has been, in the opinion of the board, still more remarkable. Work was begun when Texas had only a small, scattered, and spiritually neglected population. To-day it is one of the strongest of Baptist States. The history of the Cuban mission is full of romantic interest. The mission had its origin in the conversion of Alberto J. Diaz, a captain in the rebel army during the last Cuban rebellion, whom the exigencies of war had driven to sea in a small craft, who was rescued by a passing vessel when in imminent danger, who made his way to New York, entered upon a course of medical study, and while dangerously ill in a hospital was brought, through the kindly ministrations of a Baptist lady and the reading of a Spanish New Testament, to a knowledge of the truth. He was baptized into the fellowship of the Willoughby Avenue Church, Brooklyn, and, led by an irresistible influence, he soon afterward returned to Cuba to proclaim to his benighted fellow-countrymen the gospel of salvation. Repudiated by kindred and friends, he began to hold evangelistic meetings, supporting himself by the practice of medicine. A number of converts were soon gained. The priests became alarmed and "boycotted" his medical practice. Having secured an appointment as colporteur under a Philadelphia Bible society, he continued his work. In true apostolic fashion he endured persecution. Imprisonment, mob violence, and attempted assassination at the hands of a priest were his portion. Yet he went steadily forward, his eloquent and zealous proclamation of the truth attracting multitudes of hearers and gaining many converts. The conversion of a Cuban at Key West, Fla., where a Baptist missionary was laboring, led to the establishment of a special mission for the Cubans residing there and furnished the connecting-link between

the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention and the Cuban mission inaugurated by Diaz. The greatest enthusiasm was aroused among Southern Baptists. Influential deputations visited Cuba and became convinced that Diaz had in him all the elements of a master missionary, and that Providence had through him opened a door for the gospel that must be entered. The greatest difficulty had been experienced by Diaz in securing a suitable place for religious services. Multitudes were eager to hear the proclamation of the truth, and a large building could at once be filled. With funds raised through the Home Mission Board a fine theater building was purchased in Havana at a cost of \$75,000. Since that time the work has been carried forward with unabated zeal and success. To the evangelizing agencies of the mission belong a girls' school and a hospital for women and children. The statistics for 1894 are: 24 missionaries employed (all but one native Cubans), 150 baptized, and a total membership of 2582.

The board has sustained successful missions among the Germans of Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and Texas, and among the French of Missouri and Louisiana. The obligation to put forth earnest effort for the evangelization of the millions of colored people in the South has from the first been recognized, but since 1865 far less attention has been given to this important department of work than might reasonably have been expected. This may be due, in part, to the fact that the Northern Baptists are doing a very extensive work among these people. The work undertaken by the board has been chiefly in the line of holding institutes for the instruction of colored preachers. Still more has been accomplished by the Home Mission Boards of the State Conventions.

The mountain regions of the South furnish an almost

unlimited field for the activity of the board. It covers extensive portions of West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, with a population of 3,000,000, a majority of whom are under Baptist influence. These regions are the stronghold of the anti-missionary spirit. The people are for the most part illiterate, and strongly prejudiced against modern evangelical methods. In the opinion of the board "there are no people whose wants are more pressing, whose condition demands more of thought to devise plans to meet their necessities, or more of wisdom in their application. There are no people whose future, when they shall be properly developed, promises so much of usefulness to the world." The most effective method of reaching this vast population with evangelical influence is thought to be the establishment of denominational schools. Eight Baptist high schools have been established in North Georgia under the fostering care of the board, five in western North Carolina, and one in Kentucky. It is the intention of the board to go forward along this line till all these vast regions shall have been supplied with Christian educational facilities.

Special attention is being given by the board to the evangelizing of the cities, a work greatly neglected by Southern Baptists in earlier times.

Since the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention the Baptist membership of the territory covered has increased from about 450,000, of whom 200,000 were colored, to 2,654,397, of whom 1,291,046 are colored.¹ It is estimated that at least 2250 churches have been constituted through the agency of the board, and that at least

¹ These figures for 1893 are considerably less than those of the United States census of 1890 (see vol. i. of the present series, pp. 27, 30, 36, 38, 40, 43, 44, 48, 52, 53). On the basis of the census figures the present number of Southern Baptists would exceed 3,000,000.

200,000 have been converted and baptized in connection with its efforts. The board has aided in erecting nearly 1000 houses of worship. The receipts of the board for the year ending May, 1893, amounted to \$106,989.58, of which \$36,040.69 were special. Coöperative bodies reported for the same period \$134,130.35. Since 1888 the board has issued a monthly journal entitled "Our Home Field." To Dr. I. T. Tichenor, corresponding secretary of the board since 1882, is due much of the credit for the enlargement of its work.

Equally aggressive and progressive has been the work of the Foreign Mission Board. China and Africa were the first countries to which attention was directed. Two of the missionaries of the Triennial Convention, J. L. Shuck and T. J. Roberts, transferred their services to the Southern board soon after its organization. The Canton mission was strengthened by several new appointments (1846 onward). In 1847 the Shanghai mission was opened, with M. T. Yates, J. L. Shuck, and T. W. Tobey as missionaries. The Shantung and Tung-Chow missions were inaugurated in 1860 under the direction of J. L. Holmes and J. B. Hartwell. In Africa missions were opened in Liberia from 1846 onward. In 1860 there were in this region 24 stations and churches, 18 pastors, and 1258 members. The Yoruba mission dates from 1850. The Italian mission was organized in 1870 and has had a successful history. The chief missionaries have been W. N. Cote, G. B. Taylor, and J. H. Eager. Brazil was occupied in 1879 and Mexico in 1880. The last named is in some respects the most interesting and hopeful field cultivated by the board. Japan was entered in 1889. The present work of the board is as follows: In the Chinese missions work is carried forward at 9 main stations and 48 out-stations by 15 male and 23 female missionaries (including wives of

missionaries); 13 churches have been organized and have a membership of 1243. The condition of these missions is regarded as hopeful. In Africa the board sustains 4 main stations and 4 out-stations, worked by 4 male missionaries and 5 female (including missionaries' wives). There are 5 churches, with a membership of 166. This has been one of the most discouraging fields cultivated by the board. As in most African missions, the loss of life has been appalling. The Italian mission is one of the most interesting. It has 15 main stations and 54 out-stations, 2 male missionaries and 1 female, 17 churches, and 372 members. In Brazil 11 main stations and 21 out-stations are cultivated by 9 male and 6 female missionaries. The converts have been gathered in 11 churches, with a membership of 519. In Mexico the board has 9 main stations and 30 out-stations, directed by 10 male and 15 female missionaries; 37 churches have been organized and have a membership of 1163. The Japanese mission has 2 main stations and 4 out-stations, worked by 2 missionaries and their wives. A church has been organized with a membership of 31. For the year ending May, 1893, the Foreign Mission Board received \$154,686.28, of which \$20,110 were given as a special Centennial Fund. The corresponding secretaries of the board have been men of high character and admirable devotion to the work. J. B. Taylor served from 1846 until his death, in 1872, and was succeeded by H. A. Tupper, who served with great efficiency until 1893, and wrote an excellent history of the foreign mission work of the Convention. The present secretary is R. J. Willingham, who has entered upon his work with marked enthusiasm, and who is possessed of organizing ability and capacity for work in a very high measure.

In 1891 the Convention appointed a Sunday-school

Board, whose chief function is to supply periodicals, song-books, Bibles, Testaments, cards, maps, and other requisites for Sunday-schools. The board has its headquarters at Nashville. T. P. Bell is its efficient corresponding secretary and treasurer. It publishes "The Teacher," lesson quarterlies of various grades, lesson leaflets, children's illustrated papers, and "The Young People's Leader." Its receipts for the year ending May, 1894, were \$48,539.16.

The Southern Baptist Convention has always been particularly happy in its choice of presiding officers. While other bodies have passed the office around in a complimentary way, without much regard to presiding ability, this body has been presided over by a succession of the ablest parliamentarians that the denomination has possessed, and has established the habit of continuing through a series of years presidents who have shown special fitness for the office. The first president was the venerable William B. Johnson, of South Carolina, who had presided over the Triennial Convention. He was succeeded in 1851 by R. B. C. Howell. Richard Fuller held the position from 1859 to 1863, P. H. Mell from 1863 to 1872 and again from 1881 to 1887, J. P. Boyce from 1872 to 1880 and in 1888, and Jonathan Haralson, a high judicial officer, from 1889 to the present.

The triennial meetings gave place after 1849 to biennial. Since 1866 annual meetings have been held. It is probable that the Southern Baptist Convention is surpassed in the ability and eloquence of its members and in the dignity of its proceedings by no similar body of any denomination. Unfortunately, the grace of giving has not been developed to a satisfactory extent in the churches of the Convention. Pronounced opposition to benevolent institutions is now almost confined to the mountain regions, but the proportion of those who actively aid in carrying forward the en-

terprises of the denomination is far smaller than among Baptists of other parts of the continent. Referring with gratitude to the growth of the denomination, in the territory covered by the Convention, from 450,000 in 1845 to 2,500,000 in 1894, the secretary of the Home Board writes: "And yet our rejoicings are beclouded by the painful fact that the spirit of missions has made so little progress in our churches. It is estimated that of the one million and a half of our [white] church-members not more than one third . . . ever give anything to mission work. We are nurturing in our churches a million baptized believers who ignore alike the purpose for which our God sent his Son into the world, the great command of our Saviour, and the needs of a race perishing in its guilt. . . . In one of our large city churches, where especial pains have been taken to secure contributions from every member, the contributors reach about one fifth of the membership. In another, where a liberal contribution was taken for one of our mission boards, the number contributing was confined to less than a hundred out of a membership of more than a thousand." It is evident that the poverty of the South is not a sufficient explanation of this widespread indifference to missionary enterprise.

The support of pastors throughout the territory of the Convention is far less generous than it should be. Outside of the towns and cities few churches enjoy the advantages of a weekly ministry. A large proportion of the churches are content with monthly services, and many pastors are obliged to supplement the pittance that they receive from four churches by school-teaching or farming. This state of things is probably due to the fact that in the earlier time a large proportion of the pastors were uneducated men, who were content to follow their secular avocations during the week and to preach without remuneration

on Sundays. The general indifference to missions may be due to the same cause. Accustomed to see Christian work carried on without expense, it is difficult for members of such churches to understand that money is really needed for the world's evangelization; and they are likely to suspect that moneys collected are extravagantly used. But there has been of late years a notable improvement in pastoral support and in contributions to missionary and educational objects.

As has already been stated, a colored Baptist membership about equal to that of the white churches covers the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention. Before emancipation the great mass of the colored Baptist membership was gathered in the white churches. Their spiritual needs were thus well cared for, and the Christian owners of slaves showed in many cases a most commendable interest in their moral and religious welfare. Special pews in the rear of the churches or in the galleries were set aside for their use. In many of the cities large colored churches were gathered from an early date. President Ryland, of Richmond College, ministered for years to a large colored Baptist church. Many of the ablest ministers held special services for the colored people of the communities in which they lived. It was natural that with emancipation the colored people should have desired to enjoy complete independence in religious matters and should have withdrawn from the churches in which they could not expect to be treated as equals. Being ignorant themselves, the members of the colored churches could not be expected to be fastidious about the quality of the preaching to which they listened, and as no educated ministers of their own race were available they had to be content with the services of the uneducated. Much has been done by the American Baptist Home Mission Society in educating preachers and

teachers, and education is gradually affecting the masses of the colored population; but the work is too vast to be accomplished in a day, and immense areas of darkness and destitution remain to be overcome. It is doubtful whether, with all the effort that has been put forth, the spiritual needs of the colored people are as well cared for as they were before emancipation; but the separation and the independent development of the colored churches were an inevitable stage in the working out of the destiny of the race, and it is to be hoped that the agencies now at work, multiplied by the increased liberality of the denomination North and South, will in time provide this great portion of our denomination with educated teachers and preachers and elevate the masses of the colored population to a higher plane of intelligence and morality. The colored Baptists have shown themselves highly responsive to the efforts that have been put forth on their behalf. Besides their State Conventions the colored Baptists have a number of societies which aim to be national in their character, but which are not very vigorously sustained. The Baptist Foreign Missionary Convention of the United States was organized in 1880. It supports a few missionaries in Africa and sustains helpful relations to the colored Baptists of the Bahamas. The receipts of the Convention for the year ending September, 1893, were \$5590. For other societies and full statistics the reader is referred to vol. i. of the present series, pp. 27-30. The missionary and educational work that is being carried on by the American Baptist Home Mission Society will be treated in another chapter.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (opened at Greenville, S. C., in 1859, removed to Louisville, Ky., in 1877) is intimately but not organically related to the Southern Baptist Convention. The need for such an in-

stitution was felt and the matter was discussed in 1845, when the Convention was organized. The fact that several of the colleges of the South provided a certain amount of instruction in theological subjects and were anxious to expand their theological work no doubt embarrassed the situation to some extent. In 1856 James P. Boyce, a graduate of Brown University and Princeton Theological Seminary, and at that time professor in the theological department of Furman University, delivered an inaugural address entitled "Three Changes in Theological Institutions." He urged that complete provision should be made for the training of men who had not the advantages of a course in arts; that the amplest provision should be made for the most extensive and thorough training of those prepared to receive it; and that a doctrinal test should be instituted for theological instructors. At an educational convention held in Louisville, Ky., in 1857, Professor Boyce submitted a proposal on behalf of the State Convention of South Carolina to the effect that the Baptists of South Carolina would contribute \$100,000 toward the establishment of a theological seminary at Greenville, S. C., provided the Baptists of the other States of the Southern Baptist Convention would contribute a like amount. These conditions were soon fulfilled so far as subscriptions were concerned, and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary was opened in October, 1859, with a faculty composed of James P. Boyce, John A. Broadus, Basil Manly, Jr., and William Williams. Of the wisdom of the choice of instructors the history of the seminary has given abundant proof. The war of secession swept away the subscribed endowments, but at the close of the war the institution was reopened. The history of the next twelve years was that of noble self-sacrifice on the part of the professors and of good work performed under great diffi-

culties. The removal to Louisville, Ky., was a result of efforts to secure an endowment. The Baptists of Kentucky were prepared to do what impoverished South Carolina could no longer do. Heroic work on the part of Dr. Boyce and his coadjutors has resulted in an ample endowment, and splendid equipment in library and buildings. The constituency of the Seminary embraces nearly two thirds of the white Baptists of the United States, and the number of students is far larger than that of any other Baptist institution of the kind. The Seminary has 8 instructors, 260 students, and assets valued at \$775,000.

CHAPTER V.

NORTHERN, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIETIES, AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (1845-94).¹

THE secession of the Southern churches to form the Southern Baptist Convention brought on a crisis in the Home and Foreign Mission Boards. At the meeting of the Foreign Mission Board in May, 1845, it was found that by reason of the dissatisfaction that existed at the South the receipts had fallen so far short of the estimates and expenditures as to cause a most embarrassing deficit of \$40,000. The receipts during the year had really been in excess of those of the preceding year, but expenditures had been greatly increased, and increased contributions had been counted on. To meet the emergency, and to reorganize the foreign mission work in view of the withdrawal of the Southern brethren, a special meeting of the General Convention was held in New York in November, 1845. The enthusiasm of the meeting, which the increased responsibilities and a determination not to allow the work undertaken to languish would naturally have produced, was greatly heightened by the presence of Adoniram Judson, the veteran missionary, who, after thirty-three years of heroic service and suffering, had returned to

¹ See Am. Bapt. Year-books; reports of the various societies; Smith, "Miss. Sk.," "Bapt. Miss. Mag.," "Bapt. Home Miss. in N. A.," "Bapt. and the Nat. Cent.," "Proceedings Nat. Bapt. Ed. Conv.," 1870 and 1872; "Bapt. Mem.," 1845 *seq.*; and Cathcart, "Bapt. Encyc."

America for a short period of rest. There were present two hundred and seventy-five delegates, all of the New England and Middle States being represented, and Maryland, the District of Columbia, Kentucky, and Indiana having one delegate each. A new constitution was adopted, the first article of which gave to the society the name "The American Baptist Missionary Union." Life-members were to consist of all members present at the adoption of the constitution and of such others as should pay at one time not less than \$100. Missions were made the exclusive object of the union. Propositions to exclude slaveholders from life-membership and other privileges of the union were promptly negatived. The deficit of \$40,000 had been reduced to \$10,000. This sum was raised, and \$2200 more, at the Convention. Committees were appointed to secure necessary legislation, and it was determined that a final meeting of the General Convention should be held in Brooklyn in May, 1846, to receive the reports of the committees and to prepare for the meeting of the union immediately thereafter.

At the meeting in May, 1846, the treasurer reported receipts amounting to \$100,219.94. The missions of the Convention had been well maintained during the year, and 604 baptisms were reported.

The American Baptist Missionary Union held its first annual meeting immediately after the dissolution of the General Convention. Daniel Sharp was chosen president and Solomon Peck corresponding secretary of the board. Boston continued to be the headquarters of the reconstructed board. The history of the union for nearly fifty years has been one of enthusiastic devotion to missions on the part of its constituency, wise and aggressive management on the part of the board and its secretaries, and noble self-sacrifice and achievement on the part of its missionaries.

In no year have the receipts of the union fallen as low as those of the General Convention before the secession of the Southern brethren, and they have almost steadily risen, until in 1893 they reached the magnificent sum of \$766,782.95. The union has invested funds amounting to nearly \$700,000 and mission property of great value.

A summary of the present operations of the union is all that can here be attempted. The Baptist cause in Sweden, fostered by the union, has been greatly prospered. It is represented by 647 preachers, 550 churches, and 36,254 members. During the year ending April, 1894, there were reported 1847 baptisms, and contributions for the support of the gospel amounting to \$112,328. The Swedish Baptists have a theological seminary with an attendance of forty-two students, and are an aggressive body. The mission was opened in 1855. The union still supports missionaries in Sweden at an expense of \$8626. The work of the union (and its predecessor) in France dates from 1832 and is still being vigorously pressed. There are at present in connection with this mission 19 churches, 30 preachers, and 1900 members. The society expended on this field during the last year reported \$27,509, and the native churches raised for the support of the work \$3278. The German mission dates from 1834 and is now represented by 139 churches, 277 preachers, and 27,332 members, of whom 2596 were baptized during the last year reported. This mission is still aided to the extent of \$9940. The German Baptists have a theological seminary at Hamburg, with 23 students. The field of this mission extends to Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Galicia, Bulgaria, Roumania, and Switzerland. The apostolic labors and sufferings of J. G. Oncken, baptized by Barnas Sears in the Elbe in 1834, and for more than forty years the chief leader in Baptist work among the German-speak-

ing populations of Europe, form one of the most interesting chapters in the history of modern missions. The work in Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Russia is largely an outgrowth of the missionary activity put forth under the direction of Oncken and supported to a considerable extent by the funds of the union. In Russia there are in connection with the mission aided by the union 21 churches, 90 preachers, and 3985 members. The terrible persecutions to which Russian Baptists have been subjected are well known. To this mission the union contributed during the last year reported \$2700. An extensive work has been accomplished in Denmark with some help from the union. There are now reported 25 churches, 70 preachers, and 3165 members. The appropriation of the union for the year was \$1500. In the Norway mission there are reported 27 churches, 16 preachers, and 1961 members. The appropriation of the union was \$1600. In Spain 3 small churches have been constituted, with a membership of 100. The union supports this work at an expense of \$2132. Work has extended to Finland, where 21 churches have been constituted, with 10 preachers and 1329 members. Something has been attempted in Greece, but the results have not been gratifying.

The Burmese mission planted by Judson and Boardman has been one of the most successful. There are now on this field 25 main stations, 665 out-stations, 148 missionaries (including 47 wives of missionaries), 601 native preachers, 600 churches, of which 360 are self-supporting, and 33,337 members. The Rangoon Baptist College is a well-equipped literary and theological school with an attendance of 225. The contributions of the churches during the last year reported, for churches, schools, and general benevolence, amounted to \$51,999.71, while the appropriations of the union for work on the Burmese field for the

same time amounted to \$179,257.43. The most successful department of the work has been that among the Karens.

The Assam mission (1841) is directed by 40 missionaries (of whom 18 are missionaries' wives) and has 31 native preachers, 32 churches (of which 17 are self-supporting), and a membership of 3469. The appropriations to this field for the year amounted to \$42,057.

The Telugu mission in India (1840) is in some respects the most successful of the missions of the union. The great ingatherings through the labors of J. E. Clough and his associates are among the marvels of modern missions. The missionaries on the field number 88 (of whom 31 are wives of missionaries). There are 250 native preachers, 76 churches (of which only 2 are self-supporting), and 54,968 members. The converts are drawn from the lowest grades of the population and are for the most part extremely poor; hence the slight progress in the direction of self-support as compared with that of Burmah and Assam, where a better class of people are reached. A theological seminary at Ramapatam has been training preachers for the field since 1874, and a college has just been established at Ongole. Both are partially endowed. The appropriations for the last year reported amounted to \$116,468.

The Chinese mission (1833) is one of the oldest missions of the union, and although it has enjoyed the prolonged services of some of the ablest missionaries of the age, among whom William Dean and William Ashmore may be specially mentioned, progress has not been commensurate with effort. Eleven main stations and 67 out-stations are cultivated by 80 missionaries (of whom 26 are missionaries' wives) and by 50 native preachers. There are 20 churches (of which 3 are self-supporting) and 1553 members. The appropriations for the year were \$75,427.96.

The Japanese mission (1872) has 8 main stations and 70 out-stations, and its work is directed by 50 missionaries (of whom 16 are missionaries' wives). It has 39 native preachers and 19 churches, with a membership of 1665. Two of the churches are self-supporting.

The African mission (1878) embraces 10 main stations and 16 out-stations and is served by 50 missionaries (of whom 15 are wives of missionaries); 1217 members are gathered in 14 churches.

The total number of church-members in connection with the missions of the union in heathen lands, according to the latest report, is 96,109; in connection with European missions the number reported is 89,119. The former are almost exclusively the result of the work supported by the union; the latter are so in a far less degree.

No mission society, with work so widespread and diversified, is able to report as large results in proportion to the money expended and the effort put forth.

Up to 1865 the Missionary Union continued to sustain the missions among the aborigines that had been undertaken by the General Convention, except such as fell within the territory of the Southern Baptist Convention. An educational and evangelizing work of considerable importance was accomplished. In 1865 this work was assumed by the American Baptist Home Mission Society.

The history of the American Baptist Home Mission Society since 1845 has been that of almost steady progress and of highly creditable achievement. The withdrawal of the Southern churches produced little apparent effect on the financial receipts, which soon far exceeded the highest figures that had been reached before the division. The largest amount ever received in one year was \$551,595.92, for the year ending April, 1888; for the year ending April, 1894, the receipts were \$333,137.61, which may be re-

garded as about the normal income of the society. The society has invested funds and property to the value of more than \$1,500,000.

The society devotes a large part of its income to mission work among the foreign populations of the country. During the last year reported the society expended for work done among the Germans \$20,404, among the Scandinavians, \$26,296, among the French, \$6618, among the Chinese, \$5680, among the Bohemians, \$700, among the Poles, \$300, among the Finns, \$187.50, among the Portuguese, \$187.50. Mission work was done among the Indians at an expense of \$8788, among the colored people at an expense of \$12,562, and among the Mexicans at an expense of \$16,447. Among English-speaking peoples \$131,024 were expended. The field of the society embraces every State and Territory of the United States (including Alaska), Mexico, British Columbia, and Manitoba.

A vast educational work is carried forward by the society among the colored people of the South, the Indians, the Chinese, and the Mexicans. Thirty-three schools and colleges are maintained at an expense of \$171,856. This educational work is superintended by Dr. M. MacVicar, one of the most experienced educators in the country, and is believed to be conducted in a most economical and efficient manner. Most of the schools have normal departments for the training of teachers, and instruction in the Bible and in methods of Christian work is given in all. Attention is given to manual training in several of the schools, and to domestic economy in most of them. The schools are classified as follows by the superintendent: 14 higher and 15 secondary schools for the colored people; 1 higher and 4 secondary schools for the Indians. The schools for colored people are distributed throughout the Southern States. The school property is valued at nearly \$1,000,000, and

some of the schools have small endowments. About 6000 students received instruction during the last year reported.

An important part of the work of the society is that of assisting by gift and loan in the erection of houses of worship. This department of the work has of late years been vigorously administered with excellent results. In the sixty-two years of its existence the society has received \$8,038,082.24, has been instrumental in the organization of 5629 churches, and 134,179 baptisms have been reported in connection with its work. It has had a succession of able administrative officers: Jonathan Goings, B. M. Hill, J. S. Backus, Nathan Bishop, S. S. Cutting, H. L. Morehouse, and the present secretary, T. J. Morgan. Judging by the results, the administration of Secretary Morehouse (1880-93) has been among the ablest, and the work can hardly fail to go successfully forward under the present gifted and experienced secretary.

The American Baptist Publication Society may be said to be national in its constituency. It has three main departments: Publication, Bible, and Missionary. Its book and tract publication business has become very extensive; fourteen Sunday-school periodicals issue from its presses in large editions. The Bible department distributes the Scriptures in various versions. The work of completing the Bible Union version has been intrusted to competent scholars. A valuable Sunday-school and colportage work has been accomplished by the missionary department, and ministers have been supplied with books. The net assets of the society are about \$1,000,000. The society has been among the chief agencies for the advancement of Baptist principles and evangelical Christianity in America. For many years Benjamin Griffith was the efficient administrative head. He has been succeeded by Colonel C. H. Banes, one of the ablest business men of Philadelphia.

The American Baptist Education Society was organized in 1888. For many years the need for such a society had been felt, and efforts were made from 1867 onward to secure a general agency for supervising the educational movements of the denomination. In October, 1867, the New York Baptist State Convention appointed a committee to arrange for the formation of an Educational Commission for the promotion of a wider popular interest in the higher forms of education and a more adequate increase in the number of educated Baptist ministers. An Educational Commission was created shortly afterward, with S. S. Cutting as secretary. The commission at first restricted its operations to New York and New Jersey. The secretary soon found that the work could not be thus restricted, and his interest in the welfare of the denomination at large led to the calling of a National Baptist Educational Convention. In two great conventions, the first held in Brooklyn in 1870, the second in Philadelphia in 1872, the ablest Baptist educators from all parts of the United States gathered and discussed with freedom and fullness the educational problems of the time. At the first meeting the name of the commission was changed to the American Baptist Educational Commission. A constitution was adopted at the Convention of 1872. A mighty impulse was given to the cause of Christian education, and many of our colleges and seminaries owe much of their prosperity to the quickening of popular interest through this agency; but it had no financial basis beyond the subscriptions of a few individuals who took an interest in effecting the organization, and it was allowed to perish.

The American Baptist Education Society was organized (in 1888) for the following objects: "1. To promote the establishment of schools wherever deemed desirable for the development of a wise and comprehensive educational

system, by such coöperation as may be practicable in securing sites, buildings, and equipment; and, in the early stages of such undertakings, by payment, in part, of teachers' salaries. 2. To stimulate effort for the endowment of institutions of learning. 3. To promote a lively interest among Baptists in Christian education, and especially to stimulate our young people to acquire the best education possible. 4. To promote the best education of the Baptist ministry, coöperating whenever advisable with existing organizations for ministerial education, and with our theological institutions in seminary extension work for pastors. 5. To contend for the application of the principle of separation of church and state in educational matters. 6. To solicit, receive, and hold in trust, permanent funds, the income of which shall be applied to the general purposes of the society or to the specific educational objects, as designated by donors. 7. To procure, compile, and publish annually the principal facts concerning the condition and progress of educational enterprises of Baptists in North America."

The chief work of the society so far, and that which has given it the strong position that it occupies to-day, has been the administration, according to the above principles, of the educational gifts of Mr. John D. Rockefeller. It is probable that the society had its origin in his known desire for such a denominational agency for the administration of the funds that he was ready to bestow for the promotion of denominational education. The society was intrusted with the work of raising the funds necessary for securing Mr. Rockefeller's first gift for the founding of the University of Chicago. The society seeks to promote the affiliation of smaller colleges with the University of Chicago, and has aided many institutions in the West and South in paying debts and increasing endowments. Its donations

have been conditioned on the raising of several times the amounts from other sources. The first efficient secretary, F. T. Gales, has been succeeded by H. L. Morehouse, who, as secretary of the Home Mission Society, was largely instrumental in securing the formation of the Education Society.

The Baptist Young People's Union of America was organized in 1891 and has already attained to large proportions. It is an international society, admitting Canadian Baptists on equal terms. Its design is to promote a fraternal union of all young people's organizations in the Baptist churches of North America. It is modeled on the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, and aims to emphasize denominational principles in a way that is not possible in an interdenominational organization. Its annual conventions have been attended by thousands and have been full of enthusiasm. By means of its Christian Culture Courses it is seeking to educate the young people of the denomination in sacred literature, denominational history, the history of missions, etc. Its headquarters are in Chicago, where its organ, "The Baptist Union," is published. A founding fund of \$40,000 has been nearly raised, and the union seems to be on a firm basis.

The Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, organized in 1871, with its headquarters in Boston, and the Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of the West, organized the same year, with its headquarters in Chicago, are valuable auxiliaries of the American Baptist Missionary Union. The Women's Baptist Home Mission Society (1877) and the Women's American Baptist Home Mission Society (1877), the former with its headquarters in Chicago, the latter with its headquarters in Boston, coöperate to some extent with the American Baptist Home Mission Society, but also do independent

work. The former sustains a missionary training-school in Chicago.

The American Baptist Historical Society was organized in 1853 and has its rooms in Philadelphia. It has collected about seventy-five hundred bound volumes and a large number of pamphlets, pertaining chiefly to the history of the denomination.

The American Baptist Congress is an international organization whose object is stated to be "to promote a healthful sentiment among Baptists through free and courteous discussion of current questions by suitable persons." It was organized in 1882 and holds an annual meeting for the reading and discussion of papers on religious and social matters of current interest. A valuable body of literature is being formed by the annual publication of its proceedings.

The work of the denomination in literary and theological education during the past fifty years has been too large and manifold to be treated advantageously in the space that is available. Most of the colleges North and South founded before 1845 have survived and have greatly added to their endowments, equipment, and usefulness. Brown University, the oldest of them all, was never so prosperous as within the last few years. Its endowment and equipment have made rapid strides, and the number of its students has greatly increased. Its present staff numbers 66, and its assets aggregate \$2,979,570. Colgate University (the successor of the old Hamilton Theological Institute and Madison University) has been amply endowed and equipped by the sons of William Colgate and is going rapidly forward in arts and theological work. The late President E. Dodge doubtless deserves chief credit for what has been accomplished. It has property and endowments valued at \$2,265,000.

The University of Rochester was founded in 1850 as a result of an effort to remove the institution from Hamilton. Under the presidency of Martin B. Anderson, one of the ablest of educators, the university attained to the front rank of denominational institutions. Under President David J. Hill it is still advancing. Its property and endowments now amount to \$1,129,262. The Rochester Theological Seminary was an offshoot of the university (1851). The late Ezekiel G. Robinson gave it a commanding position by his strong personality and his power as a teacher. Under Augustus H. Strong, an educator and writer of high rank (1872 onward), large additions have been made to endowment and equipment, and there has been progress in many directions. Its assets aggregate \$777,515.

Newton Theological Institution, though venerable with age, has lost nothing of the elasticity of youth. During the long presidency of Alvah Hovey, one of the foremost educators and theological authors of the denomination, it has maintained its position as one of the leading theological seminaries of the country. Steady progress has been made in endowment and equipment. It has a faculty of 10, and assets valued at \$639,603.

The Baptist Union Theological Seminary (founded in 1867, now the Divinity School of the University of Chicago) had already attained to a position of usefulness and influence not greatly surpassed by the older institutions of the denomination when in 1890 it became a department of the University of Chicago. George W. Northrup, one of the ablest theologians and most inspiring teachers that the denomination has produced, was president up to 1890. The present dean is Eri B. Hulbert. It has 12 instructors, and its assets are valued at \$525,000.

Crozer Theological Seminary (Upland, Pa.) was founded a year later. It has enjoyed the efficient services of Presi-

•

dent Henry G. Weston from the beginning, and has under his leadership, and with the generous support of the Crozer family and others, taken its place side by side with the other great theological institutions that have been mentioned, all of which are so excellent that comparisons would be invidious. It has a staff of 8 and assets worth \$594,500.

The founding of the University of Chicago (incorporated 1890, opened 1892) has already been referred to. President William R. Harper, one of the foremost teachers of oriental languages, with the financial support of John D. Rockefeller and others, has placed this new institution alongside of Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, and Cornell, as one of the great universities of America. Its property and endowments now aggregate more than \$6,500,000 and are likely to be largely increased. More than \$4,000,000 have been given by the chief founder. The number of instructors has already reached 162.

Columbian University has gone steadily forward in endowments and usefulness. Although its property and endowments amount to only a little over \$1,000,000, it enjoys unique facilities from its location in the national capital. In all departments there are 112 instructors and 900 students. The late President James C. Welling deserves much of the credit for the expansion of the work of the university.

The rest of the colleges founded since 1844 may be mentioned in alphabetical order. Many of them have fair endowments and all are doing valuable work. Baylor University, Waco, Texas (1845), has long had at its head Rufus C. Burleson, a man of marked ability. It has 27 instructors, 800 students, and property and endowments valued at \$402,000. Bethel College, Russellville, Ky., has 7 instructors and assets of \$235,000. Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. (1846), J. H. Harris president, has a faculty

of 22 and property and endowments valued at \$650,000. California College, Oakland (1874), is presided over by S. B. Morse, and has a faculty of 9 and assets worth \$107,000. Carson-Newman College, Mossy Creek, Tenn., presided over by J. T. Henderson, has a faculty of 10 and assets worth \$104,000. Central University, Pella, Iowa (1858), is prospering under the administration of President John Stuart. Des Moines College, Iowa (1865), has H. L. Stetson for its president, is affiliated with the University of Chicago, has 11 instructors, and its assets amount to \$180,000. Furman University, Greenville, S. C. (1852), is presided over by Charles Manly, and has 10 instructors and assets valued at \$150,000. Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Texas (1890), has J. D. Robnett for its president, 13 instructors, and property worth \$90,000. Kalamazoo College, Mich. (1855), has 8 instructors and assets worth \$217,000. La Grange College, Mo. (1866), J. F. Cook president, has 8 instructors and assets valued at \$50,000. Leland University, New Orleans (1870), E. C. Mitchell president, has 15 instructors and assets worth \$253,750. Los Angeles College, Cal. (1887), has 8 instructors and assets valued at \$55,000. McMinnville College, Ore. (1859), T. G. Brownson president, has 5 instructors and \$68,800 worth of assets. Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss. (1850), R. A. Venable president, has 7 instructors and \$90,000 in buildings and endowments. Mount Lebanon College, La. (1854), W. C. Robinson president, has 9 instructors and property valued at \$32,000. Ottawa University, Kan. (1865), F. W. Colgrove president, has a staff of 12 and assets equal to \$128,640. Ouachita College, Ark. (1886), is presided over by J. W. Conger, and has a staff of 14 and assets valued at \$72,000. Sioux Falls University, S. Dak. (1883), has E. D. Meredith for president, 8 instructors, and assets valued at \$43,000.

Southwestern University, Jackson, Tenn. (1849), G. M. Savage president, has 7 instructors and property and endowments valued at \$142,500. William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. (1849), J. P. Greene president, has 12 instructors and assets valued at \$303,629.

The number of ladies' colleges and seminaries is too great for even brief mention. Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. (1861), occupies a position so unique that it may well be singled out for special mention. It ranks in endowment, equipment, and in the grade and quality of its work with the best colleges for men. It has a staff of 45, and property and endowments amounting to \$1,941,956, due chiefly to the benefactions of the Vassar family. The present head of the institution, James M. Taylor, ranks high among the educators of the country.

The Regular Baptists of America have 7 theological seminaries, besides theological departments in several of the colleges; 36 universities and colleges; 32 ladies' seminaries of various grades; 47 coeducational seminaries and academies; and 31 institutions for colored people and Indians. The aggregate value of educational property and endowments exceeds \$33,000,000.

CHAPTER VI.

DIVISIONS AND PARTIES, AND CONCLUDING REMARKS.¹

IT is probable that no large denomination in America has suffered less from disharmony in doctrine and practice than the Baptists. Yet from the earliest time differences arose, and disunion sometimes resulted.

The anti-missionary schism in the present period has already been referred to. The anti-missionary parties, under various names, still set themselves in opposition to the spirit of the gospel and the spirit of the age in the regions which they occupied fifty years ago. They have manifested remarkable vitality and their actual numbers do not seem to have materially decreased; but the progress of evangelical Baptists has been so great as to leave them an insignificant and almost unnoticed minority. Their protection against the influence of modern evangelical Christianity is their ignorance; and they occupy chiefly the mountainous regions of the South and Southwest, which civilization is slow in penetrating.²

No Baptist party has labored more assiduously for the propagation of its distinctive principles than the Seventh-day Baptists. Their rise in Rhode Island, their early organizations in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and their gain

¹ See vols. i. and xii. of the present series; and works on the various parties considered as given in the Bibliography.

² For statistics showing the numbers and distribution of the various sects of anti-missionary Baptists, the reader is referred to vol. i. of the present series, pp. 45-52.

of congregations from the Keithian Quaker movement of the last century, have already been noticed. A large proportion of the old congregations have been maintained, and some have been added, chiefly by colonization from these early centers. Thus the church at Piscataway, N. J., dismissed members in 1735 to form a church at Shiloh, N. J., others in 1829 to form one at Hayfield, Pa., and others in 1838 to form a church at Plainfield, N. J. The congregations in northern, central, and western New York, northern Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska, can be traced to the Rhode Island center, and all the Rhode Island congregations to that organized in Newport through the labors of Stephen Mumford, an English Sabbatarian, in 1671. It is said that "the names of very many of the first Sabbath-keepers in the three original centers have been preserved to the present time. Of the eighty-three members of the Newport church in the first twenty-one years of its history, at least fifty-six have descendants still bearing their family names in many parts of the denomination. The same can be said of sixty-four of the seventy-five members of the Piscataway church in its first seventeen years. Fully one half of the names registered in four or five churches near Philadelphia in the first twenty-five years are well known among the people who observe the Sabbath in America. This fact is true in a greater degree in respect to the converts who united with these churches and their immediate offshoots in the next fifty years of their growth." This would seem to show that while converts to Sabbatarianism are made with the greatest difficulty, once made they are likely to be permanent, and their descendants are likely to follow in their footsteps.

Yearly meetings were an early institution among the Sabbatarian Baptists. In 1802, at a yearly meeting at

Hopkinton, R. I., a General Conference was projected, and in 1806 it was fully organized. At the former date the denomination had a membership of 1215, with 11 churches and 10 ministers. Only eight of the churches united at first in the General Conference. In 1818 the name "Seventh-day Baptist" was adopted by the Conference. The constitution was slightly modified in 1840 and more materially in 1875. In the earlier form the independence of the churches was scrupulously guarded; the amended form gives to the Conference the right to act as "an advisory council, to which appeals on certain matters can be made from the churches," and "the power to exclude any church for want of harmony with the others in faith and practice." The Conference appoints various boards for the administration of the work of the denomination.

On the recommendation of the Conference, three Associations were formed in 1835, designated as the Eastern, Central, and Western. The Northwestern, Southeastern, and Southwestern were afterward added. These Associations embrace a present membership of over 9000, with 106 churches and 118 ordained ministers.

As early as 1801 a majority of the churches began to coöperate in home mission work. In 1818 the Conference formed a Board of Missions, and from that time onward a number of missionaries were sustained. About 1836 mission work was undertaken among the Jews of New York City. This was abandoned about 1842. In 1843 another missionary society was formed, which in 1847 opened a mission at Shanghai, China. This mission has been sustained with considerable vigor, and has now a dispensary with a medical missionary in charge, three day-schools and two boarding-schools, etc. Mission work was attempted in Palestine (1854 onward), but was after a few years abandoned. Since 1886 mission work has been done among

the Jews of New York and of Galicia, Austria. According to the report of 1890, twenty-nine missionaries at home and abroad had been supported by the board, wholly or in part, at an expense of \$4578.

A partial endowment of the publishing house of the denomination enables it to distribute gratuitously and otherwise a large amount of tract and periodical literature, and this circulation of literature is probably the most effective agency employed. There is no excuse to-day for ignorance as to the views of the Seventh-day brethren, and Baptist ministers who prefer the Lord's Day to the Jewish Sabbath do so in the face of all that can be said in favor of the superior obligation of the latter.

The denomination supports four institutions of learning. The most important of these is Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y. It embraces theological, arts, and normal departments, is open to both sexes, and has an endowment of \$113,177 (1890) and a library of nearly ten thousand volumes. The other institutions are Milton College, Wis., chartered in 1867, Albion Academy, Wis., founded in 1854, and Salem College, W. Va., which began its work in 1889.

The *Exposé of Faith and Practice* adopted by the Conference in 1880 is a clear and excellent statement, which is in entire harmony with Regular Baptist teaching, except in Article IX., which reads as follows: "We believe the seventh day to be the Sabbath of Jehovah, and that it should be kept holy as a memorial of creation and a type of the saints' rest in heaven. Gen. ii. 2, 3; Exod. xx. 8-11; Heb. iv. 1-11."

By far the most important schism suffered by the Baptist body in the United States was that of which Alexander Campbell was the occasion and one of the chief agents. The events that led to the schism are fully narrated, from the Disciples' point of view, in vol. xii. of the present series.

It would not be in accord with the purpose of this series to enter polemically into a discussion of the points of difference between Baptists and Disciples; but the importance of the matter from a Baptist point of view is too great to admit of its being passed over in silence. The antecedents of Thomas and Alexander Campbell, including their connection with Scottish sects, and the manifest influence of Sandemanianism on their modes of religious thought; their unsuccessful attempt, on a basis of Christian union and antisectarianism, to secure a following; their uniting with the Redstone Baptist Association (1813); the widespread propagation of their peculiar views throughout extensive regions in southwestern Pennsylvania, Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio, facilitated by their fellowship with the Baptists; the strife and confusion introduced into churches and Associations by the propagation of these views, must be passed by with this bare notice.

The condition of the Baptist churches in the regions where the teachings of Campbell made the greatest impression was highly favorable to the rise and progress of such a movement. One of the ablest Baptist observers and opponents of the movement enumerates, among the causes that favored the progress of the so-called "reformation," "the prevalence of hyper-Calvinistic or antinomian views in many Baptist churches. Having adopted in its main points the Calvinian theology, they were led by their system into speculations as unpopular as they were sterile. To free them from objections and render them acceptable to their auditors, the pastors spent a large portion of the time devoted to pulpit labors in their discussion; and what occupied so much of their thought grew into exaggerated importance in their estimation. They seemed to think that they were called to the ministry for no other purpose than to proclaim and vindicate a few abstruse and barren points

of the Calvinistic creed ; but their ministry, excepting to a few indoctrinated zealots, was not pleasing. The people generally, becoming disgusted with such dry and unsatisfying speculations, were ready to attend on any ministry which promised them a more palatable, if not a more nutritious, diet. In churches of this sort Mr. Campbell found his way prepared before him " (Jeter, "Campbellism Examined," pp. 79, 80).

Alexander Campbell was a man of fair education and of unbounded confidence in his resources and his tenets. He was possessed of a powerful personality and was one of the ablest debaters of his age. In the use of caricature and sarcasm he has rarely been surpassed. Throughout the regions that he chose for the propagation of his views the number of Baptist ministers who could in any way approach him in argumentative power or in ability to sway the masses of the people was very small. The claim that he made to being the reformer of Christendom and the restorer of "the ancient gospel," long since buried beneath human traditions, and his unrelenting and merciless warfare against the clergy, including the Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist ministry ; his pronounced opposition to missionary societies and to all so-called "human institutions" for the propagation of the gospel ; his repudiation of creeds and his insistence on limiting doctrinal statements to the language of Scripture ; his repudiation of the requirement of the relation of one's Christian experience before baptism, which prevailed in Baptist churches and which was in some respects open to criticism, and his substitution therefor of a simple acknowledgment of belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God as a prerequisite to baptism for the remission of sins—these and other features of his system proved highly popular, and there were few Baptist churches in the regions traversed by Campbell and his followers that

were not more or less affected by his views. The crisis occurred in 1826 and 1827, when a number of Associations took action against the encroachments of the new doctrines and insisted on conformity to the Philadelphia Confession, which had been recognized as the standard of orthodoxy by most of the Associations on their organization.

From this time onward the followers of Campbell assumed the position of a distinct denomination. After the party had accepted the responsibilities of denominational life, and especially since the death of Alexander Campbell, its attitude toward other denominations became less beligerent. Its representatives no longer stigmatize the ministry of evangelical denominations as "priests," "popes," "cardinals," "textuaries," "scrap-doctors," "goat-milk-ers," etc.; they no longer denounce ministers who receive salaries as "hirelings"; they no longer stigmatize Baptist and other evangelical churches as "the legitimate daughters of that mother of harlots, the Church of Rome"; they no longer teach that "an attempt to convert pagans and Mohammedans to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and the sent of the Father, until Christians are united, is also an attempt to frustrate the prayer of the Messiah, to subvert his throne and government," or assert that the Bible "gives us no idea of a missionary without the power of working miracles," but, on the contrary, carry on aggressive missionary work in pagan and Mohammedan lands; they no longer caricature solemn services in which Baptist missionaries are set apart for work among the heathen, or seek to throw suspicion on the honesty of those who collect and administer missionary funds by speaking of "the missionary plan" as, "in many instances," "a system of iniquitous speculation and speculation," or by characterizing the modern missionary method as "the plan of saving the world

by means of money and science ; of converting pagans by funds raised indirectly from spinning-wheels, fruit-stalls, corn-fields, melon patches, potato lots, rags, children's playthings, and religious newspapers consecrated to missionary purposes " ; they no longer speak of Bible societies and other benevolent organizations as " fashionable projects " that " deserve no more regard from sober Christians, Christians intelligent in the New Testament, than the vagaries, the febrile flights of patients in an inflammatory fever " ; they no longer caricature the Christian experiences that are related in evangelical churches as a condition of receiving baptism ; they no longer repudiate Christian institutions of learning as unauthorized by Scripture, but they cherish noble institutions in which theology, as well as the arts and sciences, is taught to those who have devoted themselves to the ministry ; they have ceased to speak contemptuously of the intellectual abilities and the Christian character of all who oppose their views.

It is only fair to say that the belligerency was by no means confined to Campbell and his followers. The polemical spirit was active at that time, and especially in the Southwest, and hard hits were received as well as given by the advocates of " the ancient gospel " ; but they were the aggressors, and in attempting to overthrow a system to which they had voluntarily and with their eyes open attached themselves, and in struggling with all their might to remain in the fellowship of a body whose principles and practices they unsparingly condemned, they could scarcely have expected milder treatment at the hands of churches and Associations whose principles were in jeopardy. No denomination could have tolerated within its pale a party that antagonized with such bitterness its ministry and its cherished doctrines.

If the Baptists of the Southwest had been in the third

decade of the century what Baptists are to-day—if they had been more intelligent and had possessed an educated ministry, if they had laid as little stress on confessions of faith as Baptists do at present, if they had taught as evangelical a form of doctrine as that taught by the mass of the denomination to-day, if the missionary spirit had been as active then as now—it would have been impossible for such a movement as that led by Campbell to have arisen or to have gained such a following as it did. It is not improbable that the influence of this party has been one among many causes that have led to the prevalence among Baptists of a more evangelical type of doctrine and the proper subordination of confessions of faith to Scripture; but in this transformation the advance of education has been the chief factor, and the pervasive influence of the liberal movement in theology in Europe and America has no doubt been greater than that of the Disciples. The influence of Methodism and Cumberland Presbyterianism in this direction has also, no doubt, been very considerable.

Baptists and Disciples are to-day far nearer to harmony than were the Baptists of 1830 and Alexander Campbell. The two denominations have existed side by side for the last sixty years, mutually influencing each other. The Disciples, as above remarked, have abandoned much that was most objectionable in the method and substance of the teachings of the founder of the denomination, and the Baptist teaching and practice of the present is far less obnoxious to criticism than it was at the time of the schism. A desire for union has often been expressed by representatives of both denominations, and it is earnestly to be desired that the time may soon come when there shall be such harmony of doctrine and practice as would furnish a true basis for an organic union. At present Baptists are constrained, by careful study of Disciples' literature and

observation of their practice, to regard the position of Disciples as unsatisfactory in the following particulars: 1. In the stress laid upon baptism and the way in which it is connected with the remission of sins. 2. In representing faith as too exclusively an intellectual act of belief in the divine sonship of an historical personage. 3. In eliminating, or not sufficiently emphasizing, the emotional element in conversion. 4. In not sufficiently emphasizing the doctrines of grace, or, in other terms, inclining toward Pelagian or Arminian rather than Augustinian or Calvinistic conceptions of theology and anthropology. Baptists have the impression that the Disciples unduly limit the operations of the Holy Spirit in asserting that he operates only through the Word; but if by "Word" we understand the Divine Logos who was active in the creation, who enlightens every man that cometh into the world, and who became flesh and tabernacled among us, the statement seems unobjectionable. It is probably true, however, that many individual Baptists and many individual Disciples are in close agreement in their conceptions of divine truth; and there are certain irenical statements set forth by leaders of the Disciples with which Baptists would find little fault. The brief confession of faith by Alexander Campbell (copied in vol. xii. of the present series, pp. 103, 104) is almost unobjectionable from a Baptist point of view. But he simply asserts his belief in the authority and perpetuity of baptism, without defining its nature or purpose. A still more satisfactory confession, from the Baptist point of view, is that of Isaac Errett (copied in the same work, pp. 104-106). It contains nothing that is positively objectionable. It is what these writers omit to say rather than what they say in these statements that prevents Baptists and Disciples from harmonizing. An objectionable feature of Alexander Campbell's teachings is his denial of the duty of the unbap-

tized to engage in prayer, praise, or other acts of devotion, on the ground that these belong only to those who have been pardoned and accepted; and that "immersion" is "the first act of a Christian's life, or, rather, the regenerating act itself."

The schism was precipitated by the exclusion of the followers of the Campbells from the Redstone (Pa.) Association in 1826 and from the Beaver (Pa.) Association in 1829. Owing to the unsympathetic attitude of a majority of the members of the former Association, Alexander Campbell had some time before transferred his membership to the Mahoning (O.) Association, a majority of whose members favored his principles. Four churches withdrew and joined with the Beaver Association in condemning the views of Campbell and in excluding his followers from fellowship. In 1829 the Mahoning Association was dissolved "as an advisory council or an ecclesiastical tribunal," and this event is said to have consummated the separation of Campbell and his followers from the Baptists. Many other Associations soon took action similar to that of the Redstone and the Beaver. The growth of the "Disciples" party was very rapid, and large numbers of Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists were won to its support. Baptists soon recovered measurably from the shock and have steadily advanced in the regions covered by the activity of the Disciples. It is probable that the cause of antipedobaptism and of immersion gained largely from the schism. That it may speedily come to an end with no sacrifice of truth should be the earnest prayer of Baptists and Disciples alike.

"Old-Landmarkism" is a term that has been used to characterize a Baptist party that has had a large following in the Southwest, and whose principal leader was the late J. R. Graves, from 1846 editor of "The Tennessee Baptist."

Graves was one of the ablest polemicists of the age, reminding one strikingly of Alexander Campbell in his methods and resources. This movement was no doubt a product of the controversial spirit that pervaded the Southwest, of which the Disciples movement was itself both effect and cause. The distinguishing features of the Old-Landmark system are the zealous advocacy of Baptist apostolic succession, insistence on the necessity of properly authorized administrators of baptism to the validity of the ordinance and consequent refusal to recognize as valid baptism administered by a pedobaptist, and refusal to recognize pedobaptist organizations as churches or their ministers as properly authorized preachers of the gospel. If the Old-Landmarkers had gone a step farther, and had refused to have fellowship with those who accepted "alien immersion," recognized pedobaptist organizations as churches, and exchanged pulpits with their ministers, they would have inevitably formed a sect. Fortunately their convictions have not carried them to this extreme.

We left the Free-will Baptists in what certain of their own writers have termed the period of the "Judges." Randall had died in 1808, and so much of disharmony at once manifested itself among his followers that concerted action was for some time impracticable. Elias Smith and Abner Jones sought to bring about a fusion of the denomination with the "Christians." This policy was strenuously opposed by John Buzzell in his "Religious Magazine," and otherwise (1811 onward). The most energetic and successful worker of the early part of the period was John Colby, who from 1809 till his early death in 1817 evangelized with remarkable zeal throughout the States already occupied by the denomination, and planted the Free-will standard in Rhode Island. From 1820 to 1830 the Free-will Baptist cause made rapid progress in Massachusetts, Connecticut,

and Rhode Island, and extended its conquests to New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, and other parts of the West and South. The remnants of the General Baptists of North Carolina were brought into fraternal relations with the denomination, and a correspondence was established with the English General Baptists. Some of the Six-Principle churches of Rhode Island entered into fraternal relations with this more aggressive party. A number of churches were planted in the British provinces through the zealous efforts of Free-will evangelists. By 1830 the denomination had 450 churches, with a membership of 21,000. Twenty Quarterly Meetings and seven Yearly Meetings were sustained.

In 1827, after much preliminary negotiation, representatives of several of the Yearly Meetings assembled at Tunbridge, Vt., to take into consideration the propriety of organizing a General Conference. A week's discussion led to no agreement as to the functions of such a body; but Conferences were held from year to year, brotherly love was cultivated, and by 1833 such a degree of harmony had been reached as enabled the body to set forth "A Treatise on the Faith of the Free-will Baptists." In 1841 the Conference adopted a "Constitution and By-Laws." The utmost diversity of opinion had manifested itself as to the powers that should be bestowed upon the Conference. One party laid chief stress on church independency and shrank from intrusting disciplinary power to the Conference; the other party felt the need of such a check to extreme independency as an authoritative body, constituted of delegates of the churches, would furnish. The constitution as adopted represents a compromise between the independents and the advocates of interdependence. Article VIII. reads as follows: "This Conference shall have the right to discipline, and, if necessary, exclude such Yearly

Meetings and Associations as may be connected with it; but in no case shall it have power to reverse or change the decisions of churches, Quarterly Meetings, or Yearly Meetings, or any other religious bodies." For a number of years many of the churches looked with suspicion on the Conference; but it gradually won its way and has proved itself one of the most effective agencies of the denomination.

"The Morning Star," which first appeared in 1826, was from the beginning a promoter of the Conference and its objects, and has been published continuously to the present time. A number of other periodicals were published before and have been published since, but this is the most influential publication of the denomination.

In 1833, under the promptings of the English General Baptists, steps were taken toward the inauguration of foreign mission work, and in 1837 a mission was opened in northern India that has been well sustained to the present time.

From 1839 onward the denomination took a decided stand in opposition to slavery and thereby excluded itself from effective work in the South. In 1841 the Conference so broadened its basis of fellowship as to take in a number of Arminian and open-communion Baptist churches and parties in New York, Pennsylvania, and Canada. It was decided to welcome these bodies without change of name, and that thenceforth "Free Baptists, Free-Communion Baptists, Free-will Baptists, and Open-Communion Baptists" should be regarded as "designating the same people."

Most of the churches had been formed by evangelists, who, after laboring for a few weeks in a community, hurried on to evangelize in other places. In the absence of a settled ministry it was customary in the earlier stages

of the movement for the churches to appoint "ruling elders," who assumed the responsibility of conducting the services and guiding the flock. From 1819 onward there was a growing sentiment against this office, many doubting its Scriptural authorization. The result was that the churches were left in a deplorably neglected condition. The evangelistic spirit so prevailed among the ministers that there was little disposition to settle down as pastors of congregations. Their evangelistic tours were planned independently and there was no certainty that individual communities would be visited with any degree of regularity. A regulated itineracy became a practical necessity.

The question of ministerial support soon came to be a burning one. Randall had supported himself by working at his trade, and nearly all the early ministers of the denomination were uneducated men who maintained themselves by farming or other secular avocations. The same causes that led the Regular and Separate Baptists to look with disfavor on a paid ministry were operative with the Free-will Baptists. The cities and towns were for the most part neglected. Lack of culture on the part of the ministers was doubtless the chief reason for their failure to occupy the great centers of influence. The importance of an educated ministry was not duly appreciated, and ministerial education was by many looked upon with disfavor. By 1839 the leaders of the denomination had come to feel that an educated ministry was an indispensable condition of denominational success. Four leading ministers met at Farmington, Me., and agreed to call for an educational convention. Seventy-six ministers responded to the call. Resolutions were adopted recognizing the fact that those called of God to the work of the ministry should be suitably educated, and an education society was organized.

The first educational work attempted was in connection with the Parsonfield Seminary. A library was purchased and provision was made for theological instruction. The work of the educational convention was approved by the General Conference in 1841, and in 1842 the educational work was detached from the seminary and transferred to Dracut, Mass. Up to 1853 "cold neglect and cruel indifference" characterized the attitude of the mass of the denomination toward the educational efforts of a minority of its members. The removal of a Baptist school from New Hampton left what was regarded as an excellent opening for the Free-will Baptists, and with the coöperation of the people of the place \$15,000 were raised and the school was reopened with excellent prospects (1854). A number of other academies had been opened under denominational auspices, and up to 1856, \$220,000 had been invested in educational enterprises.

In 1855 Hillsdale College, Mich., began its work. It has been steadily gaining in strength and influence. Bates College, the chief educational institution of the denomination, was founded in 1863, having previously existed as the Maine State Seminary. These institutions are at present the pride of the connection and are supported with zeal and liberality. A large number of schools of lower grade, some of them called colleges, are conducted under the auspices of the body.

At an early date the denomination took a decided stand against slavery and freemasonry, and in favor of Sunday-schools and temperance.

The chief obstacles to union with the Baptists would seem to be the aggressive open-communion position and the Arminian teaching of the Free-will Baptists, or, from the opposite point of view, the restricted-communion practice and the Calvinistic doctrine of the Baptists. It is prob-

able that differences on the communion question would at present be by far the more obstinate element in any effort to harmonize the two denominations.

The statistics for the year ending September, 1893, are as follows: Yearly Meetings and Associations, more than 50; Quarterly Meetings, 201; churches, 1547; ordained ministers, 1338; church-members, 82,694;¹ contributions to home and foreign missions and education, \$53,905.

Unaffiliated with the Free-will Baptists, but in substantial accord with them, are the Original Free-will Baptists of North and South Carolina, who are doubtless historically connected with the Arminian Baptists who first occupied these regions under the leadership of Paul Palmer and Joseph Parker, and who now number about 12,000; the General Baptists of Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Nebraska, and Tennessee, who number about 22,000; the Separate Baptists of Indiana, who number about 1600; the United Baptists of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Tennessee, whose numbers exceed 13,000. The Baptist Church of Christ, which numbers 8254 communicants in Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, holds to a general atonement, but seems in general to be nearer to the Baptist position than to that of the Free-will body.

The River Brethren, a Swiss Anabaptist party that settled in eastern Pennsylvania about 1750, practice trine immersion, feet-washing, non-resistance, and nonconformity to the world. They are divided into three parties, and have a membership, according to the census returns (1890), of 3427. A majority of the congregations are in Pennsylvania, but some are found in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, New York, and Ohio.

¹ The number of communicants according to the census returns of 1890 is considerably larger, namely, 87,898.

The Christians agree with the Free-will Baptists in their Arminian teachings and with the Disciples in their hostility to creeds. They are at one with the latter in protesting against sects and yet consenting to add another to the long list already existing. During the first three or four years of the present century three independent movements almost identical in aim and spirit originated in different parts of the country. In 1801 five Presbyterian ministers of Kentucky and Ohio, who were taking a leading part in the great revival of the time, were accused of teaching a type of doctrine at variance with the Westminster Confession. Becoming convinced that their views would not be tolerated, they withdrew and formed the Springfield Presbytery. They not only repudiated the Calvinistic Presbyterian creed, but they insisted that the Bible alone is a sufficient standard of faith and practice, declaring man-made creeds to be useless and pernicious. They soon came to feel that their organization of a presbytery was unauthorized by Scripture and that the entire Presbyterian system of church government was an impertinence. The Springfield Presbytery was abandoned and the name "Christian" adopted as the only proper designation of a body of believers. Robert Marshall became convinced of the Scriptural requirement of believers' baptism by immersion. Barton W. Stone attempted to convince him of his error and was led to the same conviction. They baptized each other and thus introduced believers' baptism anew. Churches were organized in Kentucky (1804) on the basis of believers' baptism and the Bible as the only standard of faith and practice.

In 1800 Abner Jones, a Baptist of Vermont, became greatly disturbed "in regard to sectarian names and human creeds," and gathered a Christian church at Lyndon, Vt. He was joined by a number of Baptist and Free-will Bap-

tist ministers, and within a short time the party had organizations in most or all of the New England States, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Somewhat earlier (1792) James O'Kelley, a Methodist presiding elder of Virginia, came into conflict with Bishop Asbury and his supporters with respect to the functions of bishops. Failing to secure the limitation of episcopal authority that he demanded, he withdrew from the denomination and organized a new party under the name "Republican Methodists." A few years later this designation was repudiated in favor of the name "Christian," and the Bible was declared to be the sole and sufficient authority in faith and practice.

The three "Christian" bodies were soon in fellowship with one another and a national organization was effected. Stone and most of his followers united with Alexander Campbell in his "reform" movement. In 1854, at the General Convention of the Christians held in Cincinnati, differences of opinion on the slavery question led the Southern churches to withdraw. The great majority of the Christians hold to believers' baptism by immersion, but do not make baptism a condition of church-membership. They refuse to set up any doctrinal test for any purpose whatever. The type of their teaching is a somewhat radical form of Arminianism. They are commonly supposed to incline toward antitrinitarianism; but the great majority of them claim to recognize the deity of Christ while repudiating non-Scriptural formulæ with reference to the persons of the Godhead. The Christians have 1424 churches, with a membership of 103,722 (cf. vol. i., pp. 91-94, and vol. xii., pp. 22-33).

"The Church of God," founded in 1830 by John Winebrenner, who had been a member of a Reformed German church in Philadelphia, is essentially Baptist. Sectarian

names are repudiated. The sufficiency of the Scriptures without note or comment as a rule of faith and practice and the immersion of believers are insisted upon and constitute the leading features of the party. The movement grew out of a revival in which Winebrenner had been instrumental in the conversion of many. The denomination has 479 churches, with a membership of 22,511.

The Mennonites, as is well known, are historically closely related to the Baptists. All agree with Baptists in rejecting infant baptism, but only a minority practice immersion.

The Dunkards have much in common with anti-missionary (Primitive) Baptists. They insist upon the trine immersion of believers, and practice feet-washing, love-feasts, the kiss of charity, and nonconformity to the world in the matter of dress and social demeanor. They have a three-fold ministry: bishops, ministers, and deacons. A large proportion of them are opposed to Sunday-schools, ministerial education, and missions. The Dunkards have at present 989 churches and 73,795 members.

The United Brethren leave the mode of baptism to "the judgment and understanding of each individual," and "the baptism of children" "to the judgment of believing parents." How large a proportion of the membership of the body insist upon believers' baptism by immersion it is impossible to determine. Most Plymouth Brethren and Christadelphians, while radically at variance with the Baptist position in many respects, agree with Baptists in rejecting infant baptism and in practicing immersion.

Of the 13,900,338 non-Catholic Christian communicants in the United States, 4,604,016, or one third of the whole, are antipedobaptists, and more than 4,560,000 are antipedobaptists and immersionists. This estimate takes no account of Christadelphians, Plymouth Brethren, and United Brethren, and so is within the mark. The figures

are from the census reports of 1890 as compiled in vol. i. of the present series.

During the century ending with 1890 the population of the United States increased from 3,939,214 to about 63,000,000, or about sixteenfold. During the same period the Baptists increased from 65,345 to 3,717,969, or more than fifty-sixfold. If other antipedobaptist and immersionist parties were considered, the rate of Baptist increase would be considerably larger. Thus it appears that from 1790 to 1890 Baptists have increased nearly four times as fast as the population. It must also be borne in mind that Baptists have gained far less from immigration than almost any other of the larger denominations. Lutherans, Roman Catholics, Reformed, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians have profited largely by the great influx of population from Ireland, Germany, England, Scotland, Italy, and the Scandinavian and Slavonic countries of Europe. Baptist immigration has been insignificant in comparison.

With so large a part of the population of the country under the influence of Baptists; with prejudices against their principles in great measure overcome; with principles in thorough accord with the cherished civil institutions of the nation; with a constituency alive to the responsibilities and the opportunities that come from past success; with home and foreign mission societies well organized, in receipt of large incomes, and face to face with their work; with educational institutions of the highest grade widely distributed throughout the country; with publication facilities and a religious press that leave nothing to be desired; with a fair measure of wealth and social position, and a firm hold on the middle classes of the population, the achievements of Baptists during the coming century should surpass those of the past.

INDEX.

- A. B. C. F. M., 388.
 Adams, John, 358.
 Adams, Samuel, 355.
 Ainsworth, Henry, 38.
 Albion Academy, 487.
 Alderson, John, 285, 286.
 Alfred University, 487.
 Alvoy, Stephen d', 344, 345.
 American and Foreign Bible Society, 430.
 American Baptist Congress, the, 479.
 American Baptist Education Society, 470.
 American Baptist Historical Society, 479.
 American Baptist Home Mission Society, 420-422.
 American Baptist Missionary Union, 469.
 American Baptist Publication Society, 427, 475.
 American Bible Society, 428.
 American Bible Union, 432.
 Anabaptists, 1; in the sixteenth century, 17; Germany, 19; Switzerland, 20; Liberia, 22; Styria and Tyrol, 23; Augsburg, 23; Strassburg, 24; Hesse, 25; Moravia, 26; Transylvania, 27; Münster, 30; Italy, 34; Poland, 35; principles, 36.
 "Analytical Repository," 384.
 Anderson, Martin B., 480.
 Antinomians, 97, 109, 120, 122, 129, 199.
 Antipedobaptists, 5, 8, 14, 22, 54, 126; law against, 126, 136.
 Apostles' Creed, the, 5.
 "Appeal to the Public for Religious Liberty," 353.
 Aquidneck, 98, 109.
 Arminian, 5, 90, 196, 234, 242, 256, 269, 301, 330.
 Armstrong, James, 404.
 Arnold of Brescia, 14.
 Ascherham, Gabriel, 23.
 Ashmore, William, 472.
 Athanasian Creed, the, 5.
 Augustin, 5, 85.
 Babcock, Joshua, 263.
 Babcock, Stephen, 250.
 Backus, Isaac, 247, 249, 251, 261, 265, 348, 352, 356, 358, 361.
 Bailey, W. E., 407.
 Baldwin, Thomas, 384, 385, 389, 391.
 Baptism, name, 1; principles, 1; root in the primitive church, 8; casualties of the dark ages, 11; the twelfth century, 13.
 "Baptist," the, of Tennessee, 425.
 Baptist Association, 349.
 Baptist educational institutions, 482.
 Baptist General Tract Society, the, 426.
 "Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle," the, 426.
 "Baptist Quarterly," the, 426.
 Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel in India and other Foreign Parts, 391.
 Baptists and the magistracy, 127.
 Baptists of the twelfth century, 13.
 Barebone, P., 49, 52.
 Barnett, Joseph, 334.
 Baylor University, 481.

- Beaver Association, 494.
 Bedgewood, Nicholas, 316.
 Believers' baptism, 22, 38, 73, 80, 390.
 Bell, T. B., 462.
 Bellingham, Governor, 184, 189.
 Bengali Scriptures, the, 428.
 Bennet, Job, 261, 263.
 Bethel Association, 314.
 Bethel church, the, 342.
 Blacklock, 50.
 Blake, Humphrey, 223.
 Blake, Joseph, 223.
 Blood, Caleb, 268.
 Blunt, John, 245.
 Blunt, Richard, 49.
 Board of Tryers, 54.
 Bohemian Brethren, 6, 16, 17.
 Bolles, Dr., 390, 391, 420.
 Boone, Daniel, 333, 343.
 Boone, Squire, 333.
 Boston Female Society for Missionary Purposes, 384.
 Botsford, Edmund, 311, 316, 317.
 Boucher, Thomas, 259.
 Bound, James, 259.
 Boyce, J. P., 462, 466.
 Brantly, William T., 307, 381, 392, 404.
 Brentwood church, the, 268.
 Bright, Edward, 424.
 Brisbane, John, 309.
 Broad River Association, 314.
 Broadus, Andrew, 383.
 Broadus, John A., 466.
 Brown, Chad, 84, 88, 94.
 Brown, James, 167, 168, 253.
 Brown, Nicholas, 263.
 Brown University, 261; charter, 262; removal to Providence, 264, 380.
 Browne, Robert, 38.
 Bryan, Andrew, 320, 331.
 Bucer, 24.
 Bucknell University, 481.
 Bunyan, John, 53.
 Burkitt, Lemuel, 291.
 Burleson, Rufus C., 481.
 Burmese mission, the, 471.
 Burrage, Henry S., 425.
 Bushyhead, John, 445.
 Callender, Ellis, 195, 196.
 Callender, John, 117.
 Calloway, Richard, 333.
 Calvinists, 5, 86, 198, 239, 256, 301, 488.
 Cambridge Platform, 182.
 Campbell, Alexander, 441, 488, 490, 495, 502.
 Campbell, Jesse H., 411.
 "Campbellism Examined," 489.
 Capito, 25.
 Cardross, Lord, 223.
 Carey, Lot, 402.
 Carey, William, 55.
 Carlstadt, 19, 28.
 Carman, Joshua, 339.
 Catabaptists, 1, 136.
 Cedar Creek, 334.
 Cent Societies, 384.
 Chandler, C. C., 417.
 Chaney, Bailey E., 345.
 Chanler, Isaac, 308, 309, 368, 380.
 Chaplin, Jeremiah, 406, 408.
 Charles II., letter from, 191.
 Charleston Association, 310, 316, 381, 407.
 Charleston Bible Society, 313.
 Charlestown, 222, 224.
 Chase, Irah, 396, 399.
 Chauncy, Charles, 133, 155, 157.
 Chiliastic anabaptism, 20, 37.
 Chinese mission, 460.
 "Christian Chronicle," the, 424.
 "Christian Index," the, 411.
 "Christian Messenger," the, 425.
 "Christian Reflector," the, 445.
 "Christian Secretary," the, 425.
 Christian union, 7.
 Church, Pharcellus, 424.
 Church and state, separation of, 63, 69.
 "Church of God," the, 502.
 Churchwood, Humphrey, 217, 219.
 Clark, John, 343.
 Clarke, John, 50, 69, 75, 81; birth, education, arrival at Boston, 96; relation to antinomianism, 97; settled at Aquidneck, 98; the foundation act, 100; "Ill News from New England," 101; the annulment of Coddington's charter, 104; the charter of Rhode Island, 105; character, 107; death, 112, 134; theses for disputation, 137.

- Clay, Joseph, 322.
 Clayton, Thomas, 207.
 "Clementine Recognitions," 9, 10.
 Clough, J. E., 470.
 Coddington, William, 75, 98, 104, 109, 119, 122.
 Coggeshall, 109.
 Cohansey, 205.
 Colby University, 406.
 Colgate University, 479.
 Collegiants, 53.
 Collins, Henry, 125.
 "Columbian Star," the, 400, 423, 427.
 Colver, Nathaniel, 444.
 Comer, John, 114, 117, 198, 230.
 Communism, 26, 27.
 Conant, Thomas J., 432.
 Condry, Jeremiah, 196, 256.
 Cone, Spencer H., 444.
 Confession of Faith, October, 1644, 51.
 Congaree Association, the, 314.
 Connection between American Baptists and Particular Baptists, 50.
 Controversy between Roger Williams and the Massachusetts authorities, 62.
 Convention of 1827 (constitution), 404.
 Cook, Joseph, 311.
 Cooke, John, 112.
 Cooper River, settlement on, 221, 222.
 Corahism, 182.
 Cornelius, John, 205.
 Cornell, Joseph, 385.
 Correspondence between the English Baptists and the Mennonites of Holland, 45.
 Cote, W. N., 460.
 Cotton, John, 62, 66, 68; controversy with Roger Williams, 70, 120, 121, 138.
 Craig, Elijah, 298.
 Crandall, Joseph, 111, 115, 134, 138.
 Cromwell, 54, 75, 113.
 Cromwell, William, 423.
 Crozer Theological Seminary, 480.
 Cuban mission, the, 457.
 Cudworth, James, 158.
 Cumberland Association, 337, 338.
 Curtis, Richard, Jr., 344, 345, 346.
 Cyprian, 12.
 Dabney, John, 257.
 Davis, John, 349, 352.
 Davis, William, 207.
 Dean, William, 472.
 Deane, "History of Scituate," 158.
 Denck, 18, 23, 25, 28.
 Denison University, 416.
 Dexter, Gregory, 85, 86, 87, 91, 112.
 Diaz, Alberto J., 457.
 Dingley, Richard, 113.
 "Disciples," 492, 493.
 Dorchester petition, the, 129.
 Dorris, Joseph, 337.
 Doughty, Francis, 233.
 Dover church, the, 281.
 Dudley, Ambrose, 337.
 Dungan, Elder, 202.
 Dunham, 204.
 Dunster, Henry, 134; birth and education, 139; Confession of Faith, 140; arrival in New England, 141; president, 142; marriage, 144; oriental studies, 145; conversion, 146; conference, 152; verdict, 153; resignation, 154; removal, 157; death, 161.
 Dyke, Daniel, 193.
 Eager, J. H., 460.
 Easton, 109.
 Eaton, Mrs., 232.
 Eaton, T. T., 425.
 Edes, Philip, 113.
 Edisto Island, 228.
 Education Fund, 381, 407.
 Education Society of the Middle States, the Baptist, 381.
 Edwards, Jonathan, 241.
 Edwards, Morgan, 261, 263, 276, 278, 297.
 "Elements of Moral Science," 445.
 Elk River Association, 338.
 Elkhorn Association, 337.
 Endicott, Governor, 136.
 Ephrata community, the, 209.
 Episcopal minister of Charleston, the, 224.
 "Examiner," the, 424.
 Exclusion of Baptists from all civil privileges in Massachusetts, 120.
 Eyres, Nicholas, 234, 262.
 Eyres, Thomas, 263.

- Familism, 121.
 Farmington (Southington), 231.
 Farnum, John, 179, 184.
 Feeks, Robert, 235.
 Findley, Samuel, 280.
 First Baptist Church of Boston, 174;
 confession of faith, 177; fines, 178;
 disputation, 179, 182; service upon
 Noddle's Island, 186; persecutions,
 188; meeting-house, 190, 197, 256.
 First Baptist Church of New York, 281
 First Baptist Church of Newport, 88,
 96; dissensions, 109, 255.
 First Baptist Church of Philadelphia,
 205.
 First Baptist Church of Providence,
 80, 83; controversies, 85; division,
 87; history till 1770, 95; Armin-
 ian, 253.
 First Colored Baptist Church, 320.
 Fishkill church, the, 282.
 Ford, Reuben, 370, 371.
 Foreign missions, 460, 461.
 Foster, Benjamin, 255.
 Framingham, 247.
 Franklin College, 417.
 Free-will Baptists, 270, 495, 499, 501.
 Fristoe, Daniel, 287.
 Fuller, Andrew, 55.
 Furman, Richard, 312, 321, 383, 385,
 395, 402.
 Gano, John, 280, 281, 284, 295, 311,
 335.
 Gano, Stephen, 338.
 Garcia, Francis, 308.
 Gardner, John, 261.
 Garrard (Garret), John, 285, 296, 334.
 General Association, 367.
 General Baptists in England, 38; sep-
 aration from other separatist con-
 gregations, 40; controversies, 41;
 after 1626 progress, 47; character-
 istics, 69, 85.
 General Committee of the Georgia
 Baptists, 323, 328, 329, 369.
 General Meeting of Correspondence,
 306.
 General Missionary Convention of the
 Baptist Denomination in the United
 States of America for Foreign Mis-
 sions, 393.
 Georgetown, 227.
 Georgetown College, 417.
 Georgia Association, 318.
 German Baptists, 470.
 Gnosticism, 8, 9, 12.
 Going, Jonathan, 416, 419.
 Gorton, Samuel, 76, 99.
 Gorton, Stephen, 231.
 Gould, Thomas, 157, 174, 175, 176.
 Granville, Lord, 225.
 Granville Literary and Theological
 Institution, 416.
 Graves, J. R., 425, 494.
 Great Awakening, statistics of the,
 271.
 Great Valley, 208.
 Green, David, 342.
 Griffith, Benjamin, 275, 280, 285.
 Griffith, Thomas, 208.
 Gross, Jacob, 25.
 Groton, 231.
 Hackett, Horatio B., 432.
 Half-way Covenant, 182, 240.
 Hall, Nathaniel, 330.
 Hall, Robert, 54, 55.
 Hand, J. R., 411.
 Haralson, Jonathan, 462.
 Harding, 109.
 Harper, William R., 481.
 Harris, J. H., 481.
 Harris, Samuel, 295, 299.
 Harris, William, 91.
 Hart, Oliver, 278, 309, 316.
 Hartwell, J., 407.
 Harvard College, 133, 134, 142, 145,
 197, 244.
 Hascall, Daniel, 409.
 Hätzer, Ludwig, 23, 25.
 Haverhill, 258, 265.
 Hawley, Major, 360.
 Hayne, William, 444.
 Hays, Edward, 284.
 Hazell, John, 138.
 Heaton, Samuel, 285.
 Helwys, Thomas, 41, 42.
 Henry, Nicholas, 121.
 Henry, Patrick, 365, 369.
 Henry of Lausanne, 13.
 Hepzibah Association, the, 434.
 "Herald, The Religious," 424.
 Hermas, 9.
 Hickman, William, 333.
 Hicks, Jacob, 258.

- Hilman, W., 404.
 Hofmann, Melchior, 25, 27.
 Hofmannites, 28.
 Holcombe, Henry, 320, 321, 322, 384.
 Holliman, Ezekiel, 79, 84.
 Holmes, J. L., 460.
 Holmes, Obadiah, 111, 112, 131, 134, 138.
 Holmes, Obadiah, Jr., 205.
 Holston Association, 336.
 Hooper, Dr., 408.
 Hopewell, 209, 276.
 Hovey, Alvah, 480.
 Hubbard, Samuel, 110, 124, 179, 187.
 Hubmaier, 18, 21, 23, 26.
 Hulbert, Eri B., 480.
 Hull, Elder, 220.
 Hut, Hans, 23, 26.
 Hutchinson, Mrs. Anne, 97; character and teachings, 120.
 Huther, Jacob, 23, 27.
 Hutherites, 27.
 "Ill News from New England," 101, 134.
 Ilston, 163.
 Immersion, 4, 41, 80, 137, 144, 155, 342, 344, 390, 428.
 Imposition of hands, 85, 86, 115, 214.
 Indians, the, 61, 64, 144, 197, 292.
 Infant baptism, 2, 3, 10, 20, 22, 31, 40, 51, 136.
 Ireland, James, 287.
 Jacob, Henry, 48.
 Jaret (Garrard), John, 285.
 Jefferson, Thomas, 370, 375.
 Jenckes, Daniel, 261, 263, 355.
 Jenkins, Nathaniel, 212.
 Jessey, H., 49, 52, 53.
 Johnson, Francis, 38, 48.
 Johnson, Thomas, 342.
 Johnson, W. B., 406.
 Jones, R. S., 262.
 Jones, Samuel, 262, 279.
 Judson, 389, 394, 419.
 Justin Martyr, 9.
 Kautz, Jacob, 25.
 Keach, Elias, 202, 204.
 Kehukee Association, 290, 307.
 Keith, George, 206.
 Keithian Quakers, 207.
 Kendrick, Nathaniel, 408.
 Ketokton Association, 278, 285, 287, 290, 301, 334, 371.
 "Key into the Language of America," the, 61, 91.
 Kiffin, William, 48, 53, 138, 193.
 "Kiffin Manuscript," the, 52.
 Killingsworth, 203.
 Kincaid, Eugenio, 409.
 Kittery, Me., 197, 216, 220.
 Kloster, Gertom, 31.
 Knipperdollinck, 32.
 Knollys, Hanserd, 51, 52, 203.
 Lady Moody, 124, 232.
 Langenmantel, Eitelhans, 24.
 Lasher, G. W., 425.
 Lathrop, John, 48, 158.
 "Latter Day Luminary," 400, 423.
 Lechford, "Plain Dealing," 144.
 Ledbetter, Elder, 294.
 Leile (Sharp), George, 320.
 Leland, John, 305, 371; letter to Washington, 372, 375.
 Lenthall, Robert, 109, 123.
 Leyden, John of, 31.
 Liberty of conscience, 44, 60, 62, 72; limitations of, 77, 79, 102, 170, 365.
 Lincoln, Heman, 420.
 Lollardism, 6, 38, 164.
 Lord's Supper, the, 11.
 Lukar, Mark, 50, 111, 112.
 Luther, 18, 19.
 Luther, Samuel, 172, 173.
 Lyndon, Josias, 261.
 Lynn, Benjamin, 334.
 Mack, Alexander, 209.
 Maclay, Dr. A., 420.
 MacVickar, Dr. M., 474.
 Madison, James, 370; his amendments, 374.
 Maginnis, J. S., 408.
 Maine, Baptist organizations in, 269.
 Manichæism, 12.
 Manly, Basil, 307.
 Manning, James, 253, 261, 265, 278, 304, 311.
 Mansfield, 245.
 Marbeck, Pilgram, 25, 28.
 Marblehead, the land grant at, 66.
 Marshall, Abraham, 319, 323.
 Marshall, Daniel, 286, 292, 294, 314, 317, 319.
 Marshall, William, 333.

- Martha's Vineyard, 198.
 Martin, Thomas, 207.
 Mascall's letter, Robert, 184.
 Mason, George, 371.
 Mason, John, 339.
 Massachusetts, the revised law-book of, 1672, 188.
 Massachusetts authorities, characterization of, 119.
 "Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine," 384.
 Massachusetts Domestic Missionary Society, 385.
 Mather, Cotton, 147, 151, 175, 195.
 Matthys, Jan, 29.
 Maxwell, Samuel, 172.
 Mayhew, Thomas, 198.
 Meeting of October 14, 1774, 357.
 Melancthon, 19.
 Mell, P. H., 462.
 Menno Simons, 33.
 Mennonites, 33, 38, 42, 45, 231, 232.
 Mercer, Jesse, 319, 321, 323, 326, 410.
 Mercer, Silas, 319.
 Mercer University, 329.
 Methodists, 7, 304, 330.
 Miami Association, 339.
 Middleborough, 252.
 Middletown, 204.
 Miller, Benjamin, 281, 284.
 Milton, John, 54, 105, 140.
 Mintz, Caspar, 289.
 Missions among the Germans, 458.
 Mitchell, 147, 148, 150.
 Moore, Matthew, 320.
 Moravian Brethren, 6, 7, 315.
 Morgan, Abel, 205, 212, 279.
 Morse, Zenas, 409.
 Moulton, Ebenezer, 199.
 Mount Enon Academy, 321, 328.
 Mumford, Stephen, 110.
 Münster, 30.
 Münzer, Thomas, 18, 19.
 Murphy, William, 299.
 "Murphy boys, the," 295.
 Murton, John, 42.
 Musick, Thomas R., 343.
 Myles, John, 162; life in Wales, 163; arrival at Rehoboth, 167; arraignment, 168; settled at Swansea, 169; death, 172.
 Narragansett Bay, 62.
 "Narrative" of Elder Russell, the, 112.
 New Design church, 341.
 "New England's First Fruits," 143.
 New Hampshire Association, the, 268.
 New Lights, the, 243, 249, 254, 256, 380.
 New London, 231.
 "New York Baptist Register," the, 424.
 New York Baptists, statistics of, 283.
 "New York Chronicle," the, 424.
 "New York Recorder," the, 424.
 Newman, Samuel, 131.
 Newport, 88, 96, 109, 116.
 Newton Theological Institution, 480.
 Nicene Creed, the, 5.
 Nordin, Robert, 230.
 Northrup, George W., 480.
 Oakes, Urian, 189.
 Oath of the unregenerate, the, 66.
 Oglethorpe, General, 315.
 Okison, 204.
 "Old Baptist Banner," the, 438.
 "Old-Landmarkism," 494.
 Olmstead, J. W., 423.
 Olney, Thomas, 84, 85, 87, 88.
 Oncken, J. G., 470.
 Paine, Solomon, 250.
 Painter, of Hingham, 125.
 Palestine, mission work in, 486.
 Palmer, Paul, 289, 307, 500.
 Parker, Daniel, 398.
 Parker, Joseph, 289, 307, 500.
 Particular Baptists in England, 48; conferences and split, 51; Confession of Faith, 52; approachment between General and Particular Baptists, 55, 193.
 Peartt, William, 228.
 Peck, John M., 397, 413, 423.
 Peckham, William, 113.
 Pedobaptists, 136.
 Peedee River, settlement on, 229.
 Pelot, Francis, 316.
 Penfield, Josiah, 411.
 Penn, William, 201.
 Pennepk, 202, 211.
 Peter de Bruys, 13.
 Peter Chelcicky, 15.
 Peter the Venerable, 13.

- Phelps, S. D., 425.
 Philip of Hesse, 25.
 Piscataqua, 203.
 Plymouth settlement in its relation to
 Salem colony, 119, 162, 168.
 Port Royal Island, 223.
 Powell, Vavasour, 54, 163, 166.
 Pratt, John, 416.
 "Presentment by the Grand Inquest,"
 1652, 132.
 "Primitive Baptist," the, 438.
 Proctor, John, 257.
 Proud, Thomas, 163.
 Providence, foundation of, 74; First
 Baptist Church, 80, 83, 85, 160.
 Pugh, Evan, 311.
 Puritans' conception of the Baptists,
 the, 122.
 Quakers, 78, 82, 112, 115, 158, 191,
 200, 206, 229.
 Quincy, 143.
 Randall, Benjamin, 269.
 Rebaptism, 16, 18, 41, 136.
 Red River Association, 338.
 Reforming Synod, the, 191.
 Regenerate membership, 3, 79.
 Rehoboth, 131, 132, 251, 257.
 Reynolds, J. L., 408.
 Rhode Island, foundation of, 74; rec-
 ognition by the English govern-
 ment, 75; the foundation act, 100;
 the annulment of Coddington's
 charter, 104; the charter of Rhode
 Island, 105, 160.
 Rhode Island College, 253, 260, 265,
 311.
 Rhynsburgers, 53.
 Rice, Luther, 390, 392, 399, 405,
 427.
 Richards, Lewis, 311.
 Richmond Baptist African Mission-
 ary Society, 402.
 Rink, Melchior, 26.
 Ripley, Henry J., 400.
 Rishworth, Edward, 219.
 River Brethren, 500.
 Roberts, Edward, 159.
 Roberts, George, 367.
 Roberts, John M., 407.
 Robertson, Robert, 54.
 Robinson, John, 118.
 Rockefeller, John D., 477.
 Rothmann, Bernard, 30.
 Russell's "Narrative," 193.
 Rutter, Thomas, 207.
 Ryland, Robert, 415.
 Sabbatarians, 111, 214, 486.
 Salem colony in its relation to Plym-
 outh settlement, 119.
 Salem Quarterly Court, 1642, 124;
 1644, 124; 1646, 125.
 Saluda Association, 314.
 Sanders, B. M., 412.
 Sands, William, 424.
 Sandy Creek, 314, 336.
 Sanford, S. P., 412.
 Sayle, William, 222.
 Schwenckfeldt, 22, 121.
 Scioto Association, 339.
 Scituate, 158.
 Screven, William, 216, 218, 220, 221,
 227, 309.
 Scripture as the norm of faith, 2, 4.
 Scott, Richard, 84.
 Sears, Barnas, 409.
 Second Baptist Church of Boston,
 257, 349.
 Seekonk disturbance, the, 130.
 Selby, Thomas, 208, 212.
 Separate Baptists in Virginia, 298,
 300; Confession, 301.
 Seventh-day Baptists, 110, 204,
 486.
 Severn's Valley, 334.
 Sharp, David, 469.
 Sherwood, Dr. A., 410.
 Sicke Frierichs, 33.
 "Signs of the Times," the, 438.
 Silver Creek Association, 340.
 Simmons, Thomas, 228.
 Six Principle Baptists, 87, 91, 111,
 116, 198, 257.
 Skinner, Thomas, 113, 192.
 Slavery, 305, 374.
 Smith, Ebenezer, 350, 351.
 Smith, Hezekiah, 259, 263, 265, 266,
 269, 278.
 Smith, James, 341.
 Smith, John (U. S. Senator), 339.
 Smith, Ralph, 118.
 Smyth, John, 39, 80.
 Socinianism, 45, 239.
 Sojourner, William, 289.
 Somerton, 218.

- Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 465.
 Southern Baptists, separate organization of, 451.
 Southern State conventions, 447.
 Southington, 231.
 Spilsbury, John, 49, 138.
 Spur, John, 138.
 Spurgeon, Charles H., 54.
 Squire, Philip, 190, 192.
 Stanford church, the, 282.
 Statistics of 1812, 379.
 Statistics of home missions, 455.
 Staughton, William, 280, 382, 385, 417.
 Stearns, Shubael, 286, 292, 296.
 Stiles, Ezra, 261.
 Stillman, Samuel, 256, 263, 309, 311, 350, 361.
 Stoll, David, 309.
 Stone, Barton W., 502.
 Storch, Nicholas, 19, 20, 22.
 Strassburg, tolerance of, 24.
 Sturbridge, 245.
 Sutton, John, 339.
 Swansea, 168, 190, 198, 253, 257.
 Sweden, missions in, 470.
 Tackamason, John, 198.
 Talbot, Matthew, 330.
 Tate's Creek, 335.
 Taylor, G. B., 460.
 Taylor, John, 337.
 "Teacher," the, 462.
 Teague, Collin, 402.
 Tennent, Gilbert, 241.
 Tennent, William, 241.
 Tertullian, 9, 11.
 Thomas, David, 286, 296.
 Tinsley, David, 330.
 Tinsley, Thomas, 333.
 Titicut, 248.
 Tiziano, 34.
 Tobey, T. W., 460.
 Tombes, John, 53.
 Tookey, Elias, 46.
 Torrey, Joseph, 111, 112.
 Tuckaseeking, 316.
 Turner, William, 180, 186, 189.
 Unitarianism, 240.
 "United Baptist Churches of Christ, in Virginia," 302.
 "United Baptists" in Kentucky, 335.
 "United Colonies of New England, The," 141.
 Unregenerate, the, 65, 68, 72.
 Van Horne, 356.
 Vane, Sir Henry, 74, 92, 121.
 Vassar College, 483.
 Vaughan, William, 91, 111.
 Vermont Baptist churches, 268.
 Wabash District Association, 340, 341.
 Wade, Jonathan, 409.
 Waldenses, 6, 15, 17.
 Waldo, Samuel, 282.
 Walker, Jeremiah, 330, 367.
 Waller, John, 296, 298.
 Wallingford, 231.
 Ward, Samuel, 261, 263.
 Warren Association, the, 265, 278, 348, 357, 380.
 Washington's reply to Leland's letter, 373.
 "Watchman, The Christian," 423.
 Wayland, H. L., 424, 447.
 Weeden, William, 111, 112.
 Welch, James E., 397, 423.
 Welsh Baptists, 162.
 Welsh Tract church, the, 208, 229, 230.
 Wesley, John, 6, 47, 241.
 West, Nat., 125.
 Western Baptist Theological Institute, 417.
 "Western Recorder," the, 425, 445.
 Westminster Confession, Baptist recension of the, 55.
 Weston, Henry G., 481.
 Wheaton, Ephraim, 172.
 Wheelwright, John, 120.
 Whitaker, John, 333.
 White, Daniel, 113, 115.
 White, Esther, 246.
 White, Thomas, 230.
 Whitefield, 47, 241, 242, 244, 269, 292, 309.
 Whitman, S. S., 409.
 Wickenden, William, 85, 89, 112, 233.
 Wickes, Benjamin, 385.
 Wiclifism, 6.
 Wiedemann, Jacob, 26.
 Wightman, Daniel, 235.
 Wightman, Valentine, 231, 234, 257.
 Willard, Samuel, 194.

- Willet, Captain, 169.
 Williams, John, 298, 300, 367.
 Williams, Roger, birth, studies, prospects in England, 59; arrival in New England, 60; Boston, Salem, Plymouth, 61; "The Key into the Language of America," 61; banished, settles at Narragansett Bay, 62; review of the controversy, 64; ideas of relation between church and state, 70; controversy with Cotton, 71; foundation of Rhode Island, 74; recognition by the English government, 75; limitations of the liberty of conscience, 77; rebaptized, 79; foundation of the first Baptist church in America, 80; doubts, 81; relation to Dexter, 92.
 Willoughby, Francis, 184.
 Wilson's declaration, 182.
 Winebrenner, John, 502.
 Winslow's "Brief Narration," 132.
 Winsor, Samuel, 253.
 Winthrop, Governor, 121, 144.
 Witter, William, 124, 135.
 Woman's Baptist mission societies, 478.
 "Wonder-Working Providence," 142.
 Yale College, 244.
 Yates, M. T., 460.
 Yates, Thomas, 284.
 "Yearly Association," 1729, 116.
 Yoruba mission, 460.
 Young People's Union of America, the Baptist, 478.
 Zell, 24.
 "Zion's Advocate," 425.
 Zwickau, 19.
 Zwingli, 20.

The American Church History Series.

By SUBSCRIPTION, IN TWELVE VOLUMES, AT \$2.50 PER VOLUME

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Vol. I. | The Religious Forces of the United States, H. K. CARROLL, LL.D., Editor of The Independent, Supt. Church Statistics, U. S. Census, etc. |
| Vol. II. | Baptists, REV. A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History, McMaster University of Toronto, Ont. |
| Vol. III. | Congregationalists, REV. WILLISTON WALKER, Ph.D., Professor of Modern Church History, Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. |
| Vol. IV. | Lutherans, REV. H. E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Ev. Lutheran Seminary, Phila., Pa. |
| Vol. V. | Methodists, REV. J. M. BUCKLEY, D.D., LL.D., Editor of the New York Christian Advocate. |
| Vol. VI. | Presbyterians, REV. ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa. |
| Vol. VII. | Protestant Episcopal, REV. C. C. TIFFANY, D.D., New York. |
| Vol. VIII.— | Reformed Church, Dutch, REV. E. T. CORWIN, D.D., Rector Hertzog Hall, New Brunswick, N.J. |
| | Reformed Church, German, REV. J. H. DUBBS, D.D., Professor of History, Franklyn and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. |
| | Moravian, REV. J. T. HAMILTON, D.D., Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa. |
| Vol. IX. | Roman Catholics, REV. T. O'GORMAN, D.D., Professor of Church History, Catholic University, Washington, D. C. |
| Vol. X.— | Unitarians, REV. J. H. ALLEN, D.D., Late Lecturer on Ecclesiastical History, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. |
| | Universalists, REV. RICHARD EDDY, D.D., Providence, R. I. |
| | M. E. Church, So., REV. GROSS ALEXANDER, D.D., Professor Greek and N. T. Exegesis, Nashville, Tenn. |
| Vol. XI. | Presbyterians, So., REV. THOMAS C. JOHNSON, D.D., Professor Ecclesiastical History and Polity, Hampden-Sidney, Va. |
| | United Presbyterians, REV. JAMES B. SCOULLER, D.D., Newville, Pa. |
| | Cumb. Presbyterians, REV. R. V. FOSTER, D.D., Professor Biblical Exegesis, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn. |
| | Disciples, REV. R. B. TYLER, D.D., New York. |
| Vol. XII.— | Friends, — Prof. A. C. THOMAS, M.A., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. |
| | R. H. THOMAS, M.D., Baltimore, Md. |
| | United Brethren, REV. D. BERGER, D.D., Dayton, Ohio. |
| | Ev. Association, REV. S. P. SPRENG, Editor Evangelical Messenger, Cleve- land, Ohio. |
| | Bibliography, REV. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, New York. |

Date Due

~~RESERVE~~ FACULTY

~~RESERVE~~ AP 25 '52

JI 15 '52 NY 28 '52

N 12 '42 FACULTY

N 5 '42

N 18 '48 FACULTY

~~D 3 '43 FACULTY~~

~~D 3 '43~~

~~D 17 '43~~

~~8 '45~~

NY 20 '48

JE 3-48

JA 20 '50

FACULTY


AP 16 '51

cc 15 '51



BW4010 .A512 c.2 v.2 ~~RES STORAGE~~
The American church history series

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00300 2542